

3.  
A  
0

**BRIEF DEFENCE**  
OF THE  
**DIVINE INSTITUTION**  
OF THE  
**EPISCOPAL ORDER;**  
AND OF THE  
**SUPERIORITY of BISHOPS**  
OVER THE  
**INFERIOR CLERGY,**  
**The PRESBYTERS and DEACONS.**

---

By a PRESBYTER of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

*Thomas Forster.*

---

In Answer to a Pamphlet lately published,  
Intituled, EPISCOPACY.

*By Thomas Howe.*

---

Χωρίς τούτων Εκκλησία ου καλεῖται. Ign. ad Trall. Sect. 3.

---

---

L O N D O N :

Printed for C. BATHURST opposite St. Dunstan's Church,  
Fleet-street. MDCCLXVIII.



BRIEF DEFENCE

OF THE

DIVINE INSTITUTION

OF THE

EPISCOPAL ORDER

AND OF THE

SUBSCRIPTION OF BISHOPS

OVER THE

INFERRIOR CLERGY

THE PRESBYTERIAL DEACONS

IN ANSWER TO A RESOLUTION

OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

PASSED IN THE YEAR 1801

AND IN THE YEAR 1802

AND IN THE YEAR 1803

AND IN THE YEAR 1804

AND IN THE YEAR 1805

S I R;

I Happened, not long ago, to peruse the Letter and Animadversions of the Reverend Mr. Forster, upon a little Tract of one Mr. Crompton; who, as I am informed, was lately a dissenting Teacher in your Part of the World. I was desirous of knowing what could be said in Opposition to it; and therefore made a Purchase of Mr. How's Book: And upon the Perusal of it I could not help being persuaded that some of our dissenting Brethren, especially in Mr. Crompton's Neighbourhood, were a little better reconciled, than formerly, to our most excellent Church of England. For it plainly appears that Mr. How is wondrous angry, and nettled at it to the highest Degree: As, otherwise, I cannot imagine from whence should proceed that contemptuous Air of Triumph, and that satyrical and ludicrous Wit which abounds in every Part of his Book; unless he supposes that his Wit will go down with his Readers for Argument: Such a Manner of Writing appearing to me very unbecoming so sacred a Subject, and what I should think was not likely to create in them the highest Opinion of the Writer. Now, until the Reverend Mr. Forster shall be at Leisure to take in hand this angry Writer, I thought it might not be improper to endeavour at making his Readers sensible how weakly he has opposed Mr. Forster's Arguments; and how little he really understands of his Subject. But the Reader must not expect that I shall take Notice of every indecent Sally of his Wit; as such an irreve-

B

rend

rend Manner of Writing does by no Means breathe the primitive and truly Christian Spirit of the Church of England. I shall only endeavour to shew the Weakness of his Arguments, where he pretends to Argument. The private History too, with which he begins his Book, I have no Concern in, as living at a Distance; and therefore I shall pass it by, and leave it to the Reverend Mr. Forster, who will, no doubt, set that Matter in a proper Light, whenever he shall be at Leisure. But whether Mr. Forster has said an Untruth, when he asserted that Mr. Crompton's Pamphlet was handed about in MS. and several Copies made of it, as of a Book that was unanswerable; and in order to make Proselytes too; or whether Mr. How is guilty of such a Thing, when he denies all this, must be left to the Determination of those who live in that Part of the Country, and should know. But yet I have been very well informed by some Persons thereabouts, that it actually was handed about, and carried to some of Mr. Forster's Friends, and himself too, as a Work decisive upon the Point; and to which no Answer could be given. This, as I apprehend, forced him, as a Party concerned, to make the Reply he did. And whether Mr. How has said any Thing to invalidate Mr. Forster's Arguments, or no, may perhaps, in some Measure, appear in the Sequel of these Papers. But our Author, before he comes to the Point, cannot help giving a Fling at our Dignities, and the Emoluments of our Clergy in Collegiate and Cathedral Churches. For, as Mr. White says, these same Preferments are so languished after, and so seldom out of the Thoughts of our dissenting Teachers, for the most Part, that they hardly know how to draw their Pens, be the Subject they write upon almost what it will, without harping upon them.

\* Episc. P. 4.    b Episc. P. 7.    c White's Defence, P. 6.



them. And our Author may possibly have this farther End in View ; which is to prepossess his Readers, and thereby make them ready to swallow, without Examination, whatever he offers by Way of Argument, whether conclusive or not, after being properly prepared by such curious Observations. For it is certain, that these Matters have no more to do with the Question between us, than the farthest Thing in the World. And I will, in my Turn, beg Leave to recommend to my Reader's Perusal the Reverend Mr. White's Defence of his three Letters ; wherein I trust he will find a sufficient Reply to the dissenting Gentleman's smart Answer, as to those Points. But among other Enormities, belonging to the Church of England, he reckons bowing at the Name of Jesus as <sup>a</sup> one. Now the holy Scripture says, that *at the Name of Jesus, every Knee shall bow of Things in Heaven, and Things in Earth, and Things under the Earth.* Hence the Reader may see whether the Church of England, or the Dissenters, come nearest in this Matter to the Precepts of the Gospel. And now our Author comes to the Point, and lets us know that, although we should have the prescriptive Right of 1500 Years, without Interruption, all over the Christian World, yet our Cause would receive no Benefit thereby, because *that Prescription, or Majority of Votes—have nothing to do here ; but it must be a Charter from Heaven that must prove a divine Right.* Now, supposing that we could not make out this divine Right from Scripture so clearly as I think Mr. Forster has done ; yet a candid and Christian Reader, who is not so assuming, nor has such a Contempt for Antiquity as some Folks I could name ; such a Person would rather imagine that the Apostles, and their immediate Successors, must under-

B 2

derstand

<sup>a</sup> Episc. P. 8.<sup>c</sup> Phil. ii. 10.<sup>e</sup> Episc. P. 9.

derstand their Master's Intent, and after what Manner he would have his Church governed, a little better than we can do at this Distance of Time. And besides, I should be apt to think most People would conclude that our Saviour could scarce have suffered Episcopal Government to obtain in his Church universally, for 1500 Years together, without the least Interruption, if that Manner of Government was what he did not approve of. These, I say, would, in my poor Opinion, be the Conclusions of such as thought soberly, and desired to avoid taking too much upon themselves. But it seems that, if the Discipline of the Church of England was to be found in the New Testament, it would lead us directly to Rome: For that is all that poor Archbishop Potter has attempted in his Book, as I know of: And yet our Author says, if we follow the Archbishop, he takes it for granted *' we must form our Church after the Model at Rome.* And I too take it for granted that Mr. How is much mistaken if he hopes to gain more Purchasers of his Book by indulging a petulant Inclination to Calumny, in slandering a most learned and worthy Protestant Archbishop. But however, if the Case should be so as he says, we shall soon see that the Archbishop will not go to Rome without very good Company: One of which I will beg leave to produce for the Reader's Satisfaction; and that is Mr. Calvin, whom I imagine our Author will not suspect to be much inclined that Way. He (when Archbishops and Bishops did most obstinately oppose themselves, as being the Pope's Vassals, to the Reformation of the Church) was the principal Deviser of Presbyteries; whereof, out of all Question, he would never have dreamed, if the said Bishops had not been so obstinate, as they were, for the Maintenance of such Idolatry and Super-

perstitution, as was not to be endured. For after having told us that every Province had amongst their Bishops one Archbishop; and likewise that in the Nicene Council Patriarchs were appointed, who were in Order and Degree above Archbishops, and did appertain to the Preservation of Discipline; speaking of the said Form of Government so framed, although he shewed some Dislike of the Word Hierarchia; " Yet, saith he, if, omitting  
 " that Word, we consider the Matter itself, we  
 " shall find that those Bishops in former Ages had  
 " no Intention to compose any other Form of  
 " Church Government than what our Lord him-  
 " self prescribed in his Word." And what does the Archbishop attempt more, than to prove that the Government of the Church, as it now is, and always was, by Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, is agreeable to the Rules prescribed in the New Testament, which is the Word of God. Mr. Calvin, then, and the Archbishop must go to Rome together, with numberless others, both ancient and modern, and much more able and learned than Mr. How or myself; if the divine Institution of Episcopacy be a Popish Opinion. But the Absurdity of such a Position as that I have pretty clearly shewn, I hope, in the Preface to these Papers. Mr. Forster, it seems, was much in the Wrong to charge Mr. Crompton with attempting to ascertain the Sense of *Επισκοπος* by the Word *Bishop*, which he had before <sup>h</sup> affirmed to be an equivocal Term. Now I really think that, if Mr. Forster had charged Mr. Crompton with attempting to ascertain the Sense of two Greek Words by the English Word *Bishop*, he had, perhaps, been more in the Right.

B 3

For  
 Verum si Rem omisso Vocabulo intuemur, reperiemus veteres Episcopos non aliam regendæ Ecclesiæ Formam voluisse fingere, ab ea quam Deus verbo suo prescripsit. <sup>8</sup> Crompton's Lett. P. 18.



For thus says Mr. Crompton : " A Bishop and  
 " Presbyter were all one in the Scripture Times,  
 " Thus when St. Paul called for the Elders of the  
 " Church of Ephesus to meet him at Miletus,  
 " Acts xx. 17. he calls these very *Elders Bishops*.  
 " " Our Translation is Overseers, but you know  
 " that the original Word is *Επισκοπος*, Bishops."  
 Here Mr. Crompton tells us that a Bishop and a  
 Presbyter were all one in the Scripture Times ;  
 because the Elders (*Πρεσβυτεροι*) in one Place, are  
 called (*Επισκοποι*) in another. But what do these  
 two Words mean ? Our Translation says Over-  
 seers. No, says Mr. Crompton, they should be  
 rendered *Bishops*. But why so ? Certainly no other  
 Reason can be given than that *Bishop* is a Term of  
 a more determinate Sense than Overseer. If then  
 we ask him what are these Elders ? He would say  
*Επισκοποι*. But what are these *Επισκοποι* ? He an-  
 swers *Bishops*. Is not this to ascertain the Sense of  
 these two Words by the Word *Bishop* ; which yet  
 he says is an equivocal Term ; and consequently  
 can have no determinate Sense at all ? But if Mr.  
 Crompton really meant to ascertain the Sense of  
*Επισκοπος* by the Word *Elder*, or *Πρεσβυτερος* ! (as our  
 Author says) he should first have ascertained the  
 Sense of that Word. For he is very much mista-  
 ken if he thinks that *Πρεσβυτερος* means no more  
 than we do by our English Word Presbyter. For  
 that Word is not confined in the New Testament  
 to any Degree or Order of Persons in the Ministry ;  
 but is applied equally to Presbyters and Apostles.  
 So that the Meaning of this Word is to be known  
 only by the Context. As when St. Paul <sup>m</sup> went in  
 unto James, and all the Elders were present : In that  
 Place the Word *Elders* means the Presbyters of  
 the Church of Jerusalem ; of which James was the

<sup>m</sup> Forster, P. 18.

<sup>n</sup> Acts xxi. 18.

<sup>h</sup> Acts xx. 28.

<sup>l</sup> Episc. P. 11.

the Bishop, or Apostle. But when \* St. Peter calls himself *Ἐνδοξαστας*, he calls himself an *Elder*; but he was an Elder of an higher Order. And so ° St. John calls himself the Elder in his second and third Epistles, although he also was an Apostle. So that the Word *Ἐνδοξαστας* was applicable, at that Time, to different Orders of Men in the Church. And so is the Word *Διακονος*. It is applied to \* Christ himself. St. Paul calls himself \* *Διακονος*. And so does he stile Timothy \*. When the Church of Jerusalem, with St. James its Bishop, sent an Answer to the Church of Antioch, it is written \* as from the Apostles, Elders, and Brethren. Were there no Deacons? Certainly no Church but had Deacons, since the first Ordaining of the seven. The Deacons then must be comprehended in the Name *Πρεσβυτεροι*. When Paul and Barnabas visited the Churches and ordained \* Elders, did they leave them without Deacons, who, besides preaching the Word, had the Care of the Poor committed to them? \* St. Paul enjoins Timothy not to receive an Accusation against an Elder, under two or three Witnesses. Deacons must be included here; because, if we consider them with Regard to their Time of Life, the Deacons must be proved \* to be grave; which Quality the Apostle ascribes to \* *aged Men*. Wherefore the Deacons themselves cannot be otherwise considered than as arrived to some Maturity of Years. So that these Words *Ἐπισκοπος*, *Πρεσβυτερος*, *Διακονος*, are used promiscuously, especially the two last, for every Degree in the Ministry. And so says Beza. These Words \*, “*Episcopi, Presbyteri, Diaconi*, *Ἐπισκοποι, πρεσβυτεροι, διακονοι*” are

\* 1 Pet. v. i.      ° 2 John i. & iii. 1.      P Rom. xv. 8.  
 Ephes. iii. 7.      Col. i. 23.      1 Tim. iv. 6.      Acts xv.  
 Acts xiv. 23.      1 Tim. v. 19.      1 Tim. iii. 8.  
 Tit. ii. 2.      Sunt interdum generalia hæc Nomina Episcoporum,

“are sometimes used in a general Sense.” And again, “The Word Presbyter here is general, and includes, in its Signification, all those who perform any ecclesiastical Office in the Church.” In short, they mean no more than we do by our English Word Minister. For a Bishop is a Minister of God; and so is a Presbyter and a Deacon. It seems Mr. Forster and his Adversary agree about the Time of St. Paul’s writing his first Epistle to Timothy, wherein he tells him, that he had besought him to abide still at Ephesus. But it is my Opinion, that this first Epistle was not wrote to Timothy so soon, (as I hope to shew by and by.) In the mean Time I would observe, that it does not appear that Timothy accompanied St. Paul, when he sailed from Philippi to Troas, and so to Ephesus, any farther than to <sup>s</sup> Asia: Because, first, there is no Mention at all of Timothy from the Time the Apostle departed from Miletum, to his joining Timothy in the Inscription of some of his Epistles from Rome. And if we consider, that Timothy was so particularly respected by him, and always near his Person, when with him; it seems strange that Nothing should, in all that Time, affect Timothy so as to occasion some Mention of him by St. Luke. And, for the same Reason, it is to be wondered that the Jews did not rather take Notice of St. Paul’s carrying Timothy about with him at Jerusalem, than Trophimus; b cause, if Timothy was amongst his Retinue in that Place, there would be all the Reason in the World to think, that a Person so much more in his Master’s Favour than any Body else, (for the Apostle declared he had no Man about him

coporum, Presbyterorum; atque adeo etiam Diaconorum. Beza in 1 Tim. iv. 14. <sup>f</sup> Generale Nomen est Presbyteri, hoc in Loco, eos omnes comprehendens qui funguntur ecclesiastico Munere. Id. in 1 Pet. v. 1. <sup>s</sup> Acts xx. 4.



him like-minded to Timothy) I say, that a Person of such Weight was more likely to be taken Notice of by the Jews than Trophimus. I observe, thirdly, That in one of his Epistles which he wrote from Rome, viz. that to the Ephesians, the Apostle does not join Timothy with him, as he does in the other three, I conjecture, because Timothy was not yet come to him from Ephesus. If then St. Paul had besought Timothy to stay at Ephesus, when he left Miletum, the Residence of Timothy would not have been so unbecoming a Bishop, as our Author pretends. However, I rather think, with Bishop Pearson and Dr. Whitby, that this Epistle was writ after St. Paul had been at Rome. For, in the first Place, St. Paul went but three Times into Macedonia, before he had been at Rome. But when he went first<sup>a</sup>, he took Timothy with him. The second Time<sup>b</sup>, he sent Timothy to Macedonia before him. Not the third Time, because<sup>c</sup> Timothy was, in all that Journey, his Companion. And it is agreed on all Hands, that this Epistle was writ from Macedonia. There must therefore have been a fourth Time of the Apostle's going into Macedonia, which was after he had been at Rome. And that he did so, we may gather from his Epistle to the Philippians, where he tells them, that *having this Confidence, I know that I shall abide and continue with you all for your Furthurance and Joy of Faith: That your Rejoicing may be more abundant in Jesus Christ for me, by my coming to you again.* This proves that the Apostle went once more to Macedonia, from whence he wrote this Epistle. And, instead of sending<sup>d</sup> Timotheus to the Philippians, as he once thought to do, he came in a little Time himself; but besought Timothy to abide still at Ephesus.

And

<sup>a</sup> Acts xvi. 3—14.  
1—3.

<sup>b</sup> Phil. i. 25, 26.

<sup>c</sup> Acts xix. 22.

<sup>d</sup> Acts xx.  
Phil. ii. 24.

And from Philippi he wrote his first Epistle to Timothy. I know of no Objection that can be made to this Opinion, but what St. Paul says in his <sup>a</sup> third Chapter, These Things I write unto thee, hoping to come unto thee shortly. But he does not say that he would come to Timothy at Ephesus. For Ephesus was the principal City, and so the Church was the Metropolitan, of the Province of Asia, having many Bishops under him in many great Cities: And so might meet with Timothy, in his own Jurisdiction, in many Places besides Ephesus. And it appears from his second Epistle, that, between his first and second going to Rome, he was certainly at <sup>o</sup> Troas, if not at Miletum; as I shall shew presently, when I come to treat of the Time of writing that Epistle. If then St. Paul writ his first Epistle at the Time I have been endeavouring to prove he did, it seems most probable that, instead of sending Timothy to Philippi, where he had, upon Recollection, determined to go himself; he besought him to abide still at Ephesus, where he had been so many Times, and for so long together at a Time, before. The Apostle besought him προσμειναι, i. e. to settle and continue still at Ephesus with episcopal Powers. And there are some Expressions in this Epistle, which import a long Continuance in the same Place. As when St. Paul says to him <sup>p</sup>, *This Charge I commit unto thee.* Now these Words appear to me to indicate that St. Paul committed the Church of Ephesus to Timothy as his particular Care and Charge. In another Place, the Apostle enjoins <sup>q</sup> him to meditate upon these Things, that is, those Things wherein he was to be an Example to the Believers, and give himself wholly to them, that his Profiting might appear to all. But this

Profiting

<sup>a</sup> 1 Tim. iii. 14.      <sup>o</sup> 2 Tim. iv. 13. & Pearl. Ann. Paul. Pag. 23.      <sup>p</sup> 1 Tim. i. 18.      <sup>q</sup> 1 Tim. iv. 15.

Profiting in such Manner must be a Work of Time; and cannot fall under the Observation of any but those among whom a Man passes some Years of his Life. Again; Let, says he, the Elders that rule well, be counted worthy of double Honour. But how shall it be known whether they rule well or no, except by long Experience of their Conduct? And how should that be known but by long Residence amongst them? And many other Passages there are in the Body of that Epistle, which can hardly be addressed to any Person, but who is entrusted with a particular Charge, of which he is to take Care of for a Continuance; even as a Bishop ought to do of his Church in our Days. But our Author says, that "there is no Manner of Proof of Timothy's being at Ephesus, when St. Paul wrote his second Epistle to him; but what Evidence there is on that Head, lies the other Way." Before we reply to this, it will be proper to ascertain what Time our Apostle wrote his second Epistle to Timothy. Now, that he could not have writ it, until his being at Rome the second Time, appears, in the first Place, from hence, that he wrote it from Rome; and "in Bonds too; which were much more cruel and severe than he had suffered at his first going thither. For, at his first Abode there, though he was a Prisoner", yet he dwelt in his own hired House, and received all that came in unto him, preaching the Kingdom of God, and teaching those Things which concern the Lord Jesus Christ, with all Confidence, no Man forbidding him. But in his second Imprisonment at Rome, he says, that Onesiphorus could not find him, without a deal of Trouble and Enquiry. He sought me very diligently, and found me,

1 Tim. v. 17.

• Episc. Pag. 19.

2 Tim. i. 17.

2 Tim. i. 8. ii. 9.

• Acts xxviii. 30, 31.

2 Tim.

i. 17.



me, says St. Paul. But Onesiphorus would not have had Occasion for all that Trouble, if St. Paul had lived in his own House, and much People had daily resorted unto him. In his former Imprisonment he thus writes to the Philippians <sup>v</sup>, *So that my Bonds in Christ are manifest in all the Palace, and in all other Places; and many of the Brethren in the Lord, waxing confident by my Bonds, are much more bold to speak the Word without Fear.* But in his second Imprisonment he says, that all his Friends forsook him, except Luke <sup>2</sup>: *At my first Answer, no Man stood with me, but all Men forsook me. I pray God that it may not be laid to their Charge.* Demas, who had been one of St Paul's faithful Companions in his former Imprisonment, now forsook him <sup>3</sup>; having loved this present World. This shews that St. Paul was looked upon by the Roman Emperor in such a Light, as made Demas afraid of his Life, if he were known to be one of the Apostle's Companions in his Labours. And, in the last Place, some Things are mentioned in this second Epistle which the Apostle could never have inserted there, if he had not left Rome, and traversed many Countries before he wrote it <sup>b</sup>. Erastus, says he, abode at Corinth. But how could St. Paul say that, when Erastus was with him at the Time he left Corinth, in order to go to Jerusalem, and so to Rome for the first Time? The Apostle therefore was at Corinth, after he had been at Rome; and left that Place, and came to Rome again. <sup>2</sup>. <sup>c</sup> Trophimus, says he, have I left at Miletum sick. But, in his Journey to Jerusalem, before he went to Rome the first Time, he left Trophimus neither at Rome, nor any where else, but carried him along with him to Jerusalem; for the <sup>d</sup> Jews saw with him, in the City, Trophimus, an Ephesian. Hence it appears, that Paul was at Miletum after he

<sup>v</sup> Phil. i. 13, 14.    <sup>2</sup> 2 Tim. iv. 16.    <sup>3</sup> 2 Tim. iv. 10.  
<sup>b</sup> 2 Tim. iv. 29.    <sup>c</sup> Ib.    <sup>d</sup> Acts xxi. 29.

he left Rome. And again, in his second Epistle, he talks of his *first Answer*. Now he never was brought to answer at all, during his first Abode at Rome, either before the Emperor, or any of his Officers, but was the whole Time in libera Custodia, lived in his own House, and preached the Gospel to those that came to him, with all Freedom, no Man forbidding him. But now he was brought to answer for what he did<sup>1</sup>, before Helius Cæsarianus, Nero's Lieutenant in Rome and Italy, and escaped for a very little Time only<sup>2</sup>, being then ready to be offered, and the Time of his Departure near at Hand. But in this last Journey it was that St. Paul left his Cloak, or more properly Roll, and the Parchments, with Carpus at Troas. For when he went from Troas to Assos, in his Journey to Jerusalem, he could have no Occasion to leave any Thing of Moment behind him, having<sup>3</sup> so many that accompanied him in that Journey; and a<sup>4</sup> Ship always attending upon him: It is therefore more probable that he left them in his Travels after he had been set at Liberty. The Apostle then was at Troas and Miletum between his first and second Imprisonment at Rome: And at either of these Places he might very well see Timothy without being enough at Leisure to visit his Clergy. All that can be said, as far as I can see, against this Account of the Date of St. Paul's second Epistle to Timothy, is taken from his saying<sup>5</sup>, that *he was delivered out of the Mouth of the Lion: And the Lord shall deliver me from every evil Work, and will preserve me unto his heavenly Kingdom*. As if God intended the Apostle should not suffer yet a good While, notwithstanding he had said, just before, that his Departure

<sup>1</sup> 2 Tim. iv. 16.

<sup>2</sup> 2 Tim. iv. 6.

<sup>3</sup> 2 Tim. iv. 17.

<sup>4</sup> Pearl. Ann. Paul. Pag. 24. 25.

<sup>5</sup> Acts xx. 4. 6.

<sup>6</sup> 1b. V. 13.

parture was at hand. It is true he was delivered from Helius Cæsarianus for a Time; and God did deliver him from every evil Work. But how so? Not by being set at Liberty again. The Apostle does not say he should be delivered from his Bonds, but from every evil Work. And what was to be the Consequence of his being thus delivered? Not to preach the Gospel any where else again. That could not be, because his Departure was near at hand. Neither could he say that God would actually deliver him from every evil Work, every evil Design or Machination of the World against him: That would not have been true; because he knew he was to suffer Death by that Means. A little before, he says; 'I have fought the good Fight, I have finished my Course, I have kept the Faith.' And when all Men forsook him God <sup>1</sup> stood by him and strengthened him: And so, says the Apostle, he shall deliver me from every evil Work, not to be set at Liberty again; but by preserving him sound in the Faith in order for that heavenly Kingdom whereto he was soon to set out upon his Journey. And if the Reader has a Mind for better Authority than mine for this Opinion, he will find much to this Purpose in <sup>2</sup> Bishop Pearson's *Annales Paulini*, and Whitby upon this Chapter. It appears now I hope to the Reader's Satisfaction, that this 2d Epistle to Timothy was wrote between his Defence before Helius Cæsarianus, and his suffering Death at Rome, which was not long; as the Apostle himself tells us. The first Epistle then was wrote from Macedonia, when he went thither the fourth Time; as we find he did from his Epistle to the Philippians. And in his Journey thither, instead of carrying Timothy with

<sup>1</sup> 2 Tim. iv. 7.    <sup>2</sup> Ib. V. 17.    <sup>3</sup> Ann<sup>s</sup>. Paul<sup>i</sup>. P. 23, 24, 25. Whitby in 2 Tim. iv.



with him to Philippi from Italy, as he first intended, he desired him to settle at Ephesus. Out of which Province it does not appear that he stirred, till, at the Apostle's Request, in his 2d Epistle, he went to see him at Rome not long before he suffered. And if all this be true, it is reasonable to conclude that this Epistle was wrote not a great while before his Martyrdom; and also that Timothy was abiding somewhere in his Province at the Time it was wrote. But, says our Author, what Evidence there is lies the other Way; against Timothy's being at Ephesus: For, says the Apostle, "*Tychicus have I sent to Ephesus*". And to enforce his Argument, he says, "It is evident from other Places, that Tychicus was one of those principal Men whom the Apostle employed in visiting Churches." But, to make his Argument of any Force, he should have proved that Tychicus was sent to visit Churches with episcopal Power, such as the Apostle vested Timothy with over his Province in Asia; and Titus over his Province in Crete. But it no where appears that Tychicus was ever sent any where, endued with any such Powers. And, to make this Point clear, let us see what Sort of Commission Tychicus used to be sent with. St. Paul tells the Ephesians thus: "But that ye also may know my Affairs, and how I do; Tychicus, a beloved Brother and faithful Minister in the Lord, shall make known to you all Things: Whom I have sent unto you for the same Purpose, that ye might know our Affairs, and that he might comfort your Hearts". The Business therefore which Tychicus had with the Ephesians was no more than to carry a kind Message to them from

• 2 Tim. iv. 12.

• Episc. P. 19.

• Eph. vi. 21, 22.

from St. Paul, and to comfort them with the Consideration of that great Regard the Apostles had for them. Therefore Tychicus had no Commission with any Manner of Episcopal Authority to supersede Timothy in his Bishoprick; but only to intimate the kind Regard his Master had for those he was sent to; that they might have the greater Comfort. But it seems this sending Tychicus to Ephesus intimates that Timothy was not there. Perhaps not in the very City itself; but yet he was in Asia, and probably in his own Province too; for he had not only the City of Ephesus, but all the proconsular Asia for his Province, of which that City was the Metropolis. So that he might be employed in the Care of his Province, and yet in a Part of Asia where he had Troas for the nearest Port for him to go aboard a Ship for Rome: And had not so far to go back for St. Paul's Cloak, as our Author \* supposes. And therefore his Wit in this Place is to little Purpose, and deserves no Regard: But, for the Reader's Satisfaction, I will consider in few Words what we are to understand by this Cloak, which has afforded so much Food for the Wit of Unbelievers; among whom I should be sorry to reckon Mr. How; altho' I can hardly think a serious Christian would set that Passage in so ludicrous a Light as Mr. How has done. He might have first consulted Whitby, whom I find he does sometimes; and he would have told him that *φελωνη* signifies a Roll rather than a Cloak. *Φαιλωνη*, saith Phavorinus, is *ειληταριον μεμβρανον*. A Parchment rolled up. *φελωνη ειλητον τομαριον μεμβρανον*, a folded Vellum or Parchment, as says Hesychius. And this Roll, \* as Dr. Hammond observes, may, perhaps, be all one with

\* Episc. P. 20.

\* See Hammond on 2 Tim. iv. 13.

with the *μεμβρανα* hereafter mentioned; (because they (being added with a *μαλιστα δε*, but especially) seem to denote somewhat which had been mentioned before, rather than any new Thing. That Roll therefore probably contained MSS. of somewhat greater Consequence to St. Paul than a Cloak. I think it must now appear pretty plain to the intelligent Reader, that Timothy was settled by St. Paul in the Bishoprick of Ephesus before he visited Macedonia for the last Time; whence he wrote his first Epistle to him: And that, for all that appears to the contrary, he was constantly resident upon some Part or other of his Province until he went to Rome to pay his last Respects to his Master. And therefore we need not be afraid lest Timothy should turn out at last to be no Bishop of Ephesus, notwithstanding all the Pains Mr. How has taken to prove the other Side of the Question; for, as to his sarcastical Wit and Satyr, the Christian Reader can scarce think it worth his Notice or mine. And I persuade myself too that all such as have not conceived an inveterate Prejudice against the Ancients, will be glad to see that Point, which the holy Scriptures have made pretty plain, still farther confirmed to us by the universal Consent of the earliest Writers. Polycrates was Bishop of Ephesus himself, and was born within six or seven and thirty Years after St. John wrote to the Angel of that Church. In a Fragment of his preserved by " Photius, we find that Timothy was the first Bishop of Ephesus." And a little after he says " that the Apostle " Timothy was ordained and enthroned Bishop of " the Metropolitan See of Ephesus by the great

C

" St.

" Οτι πρῶτον Τιμοθεῖον ἡ παρούσα συγγραφή φησὶν Ἐφισοῦ ἐπισκοπῆσαι. Οτι ὁ Ἀποστόλος Τιμοθεὸς ὑπὸ τοῦ μεγάλου Παύλου καὶ χειροτονεῖται ἐν Ἐφισοῖν μητροπόλει ἐπίσκοπος, καὶ καθίσταται. Phot. Biblio. No. 254.



“ St. Paul.” Next follows <sup>x</sup> Eusebius, who tells us  
 “ it appears from History that Timothy was the  
 “ first Bishop of Ephesus.” <sup>y</sup> St. Chrysostom in  
 one of his Homilies upon the Epistle to the Phi-  
 lippians, speaking of the Words *Επισκοπος, Πρεσβυ-  
 τερος, Διακονος*, being often used to signify the same  
 Thing in Scripture, says that St. Paul writes to  
 Timothy to make full Proof of his Ministry (*Δια-  
 κονιαν*) although he were a Bishop at the same  
 Time. The same Author says in another Place <sup>z</sup>  
 “ that it was not so much the Church (of Ephe-  
 “ sus) that was committed to his Care, as the  
 “ whole People of Asia. <sup>a</sup> Theodoret calls him  
 “ the Apostle of the Asians.” In the general  
 Council of Chalcedon, in the Year 350, which  
 was the fourth; Leontius, Bishop of Magnesia,  
 speaking of the Church of Ephesus, says <sup>b</sup> “ there  
 “ had been a continued Succession of seven and  
 “ twenty Bishops from holy Timothy unto his  
 “ Time, all consecrated at Ephesus.” And who-  
 ever looks into any other of the ancient Writers  
 who make mention of Timothy will find them all  
 of the same Opinion. It must then appear I think  
 to every unprejudiced Reader, both from St. Paul’s  
 expressly calling the See of Ephesus Timothy’s  
 Charge, and the unanimous Declaration of all Anti-  
 quity to the same Purpose, that he was actually the  
 first, and likewise the fixed Bishop of Ephesus;  
 which Charge he received from St. Paul himself.  
 And as there can be now no Reason I hope to be  
 in

<sup>x</sup> Τιμοθεος γαρ μη της εν Εφισω παροικιας ιεραταις πρωτος της  
 επισκοπης επιλεχεται. Euseb. Hist. Eccles. Lib. 3. Cap. 4. <sup>y</sup> Γρα-  
 φων Τιμοθειν, λεγει την Διακονιαν σου πληροφορησον, επισκοπων οντι. Chrys.  
 Hom. in Phil. i. 16. <sup>z</sup> Chrys. Hom. 15. upon 1 Tim.  
 Εκκλησιας ην εμπνευστηματος ο Τιμοθεος, η ης εθνος ολοκληροι το της Ασιας.  
<sup>a</sup> Theod. in 1 Tim. iii. 1. <sup>b</sup> Λιοντιος ο ευλαβεστατος επισκοπος  
 Μαγνησιας ησπεν. Απο του αγιου Τιμοθειου μέχρι ου εις ορισμωτος  
 επισκοποι εγενοντο. παντες εν Εφισω χειροτονηθησαν. Conc Chalced.  
 Part. 2. Act. 11. sub finem. Binn. Vol. 3. Pag 410.

in any Fear about Timothy, so I flatter myself I shall soon make it appear, there is no Room for doubting in Regard to Titus: Of whom Mr. How says he shall make a shorter Article. And so shall I too, inasmuch as he agrees that St. Paul's Epistle to Titus was not writ till after his Imprisonment at Rome. Neither could St. Paul visit Crete, and settle a Church, and leave Titus there, till after he had been in Italy upon his Release; for, when he sailed from Asia to Jerusalem, a Storm would not let them winter at Crete, so that he only sailed close by it. But it seems Titus made so short a Stay at Crete as made it unlikely for him to be placed by St. Paul as the fixed Bishop of that Island. For here, says our Author, "This very Titus, who one would have thought should have sat down in his episcopal Chair to rest himself after all his Travels, is presently upon the Tour again, and ordered to Nicopolis." The Reader will easily see, in this Passage, our Author's Sneer at the Episcopal Chair; but at the same Time he must observe that, if he was ever so little acquainted with the History of those primitive Times, he must know that the episcopal Chair was no such Place of Rest in those Days, when in every Persecution the Bishops were sure to be the first that were dragged to the Stake, and the first to suffer the cruellest Tortures human Wit could invent. But we are told that "Titus was presently upon the Tour again, and ordered to Nicopolis." But this is more than Mr. How or any Body else can possibly know: For although we have great Reason to think from ancient History that St. Paul did travel through many Parts of the World, preaching the Gospel, yet we have no Manner of Account in Scripture, nor any other

C 2

\* Epist. P. 24.

† Id. ib.

\* Acts xxvii. 13.

\* Epist. P. 27.

History, what Time this Epistle was writ, what Parts of the World he went to first, and what last; so that, for what we know, he might winter at Nicopolis in his Return, and take Titus with him to Rome. But however that may be, and however St. Paul might take Titus away from his Charge for a Time, I hope Mr. How will allow him the same Liberty as Mr. Calvin does to a Presbyter of a Parish, concerning whom he says <sup>a</sup> "That they  
 " are not strictly tied to their Glebe or Charge;  
 " but that they may be helpful unto other Churches  
 " upon necessary Occasions." And commenting upon those Words of St. Paul to Timothy, <sup>b</sup> *Do thy Diligence to come shortly unto me*, he observes  
 " that St. Paul called Timothy from the Church  
 " over which he was Governor for the Space of  
 " almost a whole Year." In these two Passages we have the Opinion of this admirable Divine, clearly and explicitly laid before our Eyes upon the Point in Dispute between us, viz. That Timothy had both the Government over Presbyters in the Church of Ephesus; and also that it was his peculiar Charge; whence (except upon great and weighty Cause) he was not to depart: Which is as much as we contend for. And whoever will take the Pains to peruse the aforecited Section in Calvin's Institutions, will find he was of the same Opinion with Regard to Titus, Archippus, and others of St. Paul's Companions whom he made Bishops over diverse Places. It appears, however, that Titus did not stay long at Rome; for, as soon as the Apostle was apprehended, he left Rome

<sup>a</sup> Et si dum singulis assignamus suas Ecclesias, interim non negamus quin alias Ecclesias juvare is possit qui uni est alligatus, &c. & infra. Non quod veluti Glebæ addictus (ut Jurisconsulti dicunt) id est mancipatus, & quasi affixus, Pedem inde movere nequeat, si ita publica Utilitas postulârit. Calv. Inst. Lib. 4. Cap. 3, Sect. 7. <sup>b</sup> 2 Tjm. iv. 9. & Calvin in Loc.



Rome to avoid the Persecution set on foot by <sup>1</sup> Helius Cæfareanus, and made the best of his Way cross the Country and the Adriatick to Dalmatia, and so to Crete. And this was the nearest, and probably the safest Way for him to take, as Circumstances then were, and least liable to Observation. But to prove that Titus could be but a little while settled at Crete, before he was sent for from thence by St. Paul, our Author says <sup>2</sup> that “ to visit so many and very distant Parts of the “ World, one would think, must take up several “ Years; especially the Western Circuit, where “ the Gospel had been but little published: Yet “ many Chronologers allow but about two Years “ between his first and second Imprisonment; he “ being released about the Year 63, and martyred “ in 65. It certainly is scarce credible that St. Paul should traverse so many Countries, and so far distant from one another, and preach the Gospel too with any Effect amongst them all, within the Compass of two Years only. And who these *many Chronologers* were Mr. How has not informed us: On the other Hand I shall lay before the Reader the Opinions of three very learned Men, with Regard to the Number of Years between St. Paul’s first and second Imprisonment at Rome; and then let the Reader judge which of the two Opinions is most probable. And first, Dr. Cave tells us that, <sup>1</sup> “ in the Year 57, St. Paul was

C 3

brought

<sup>1</sup> This Helius Cæfareanus Nero left as his Lieutenant in Italy, with absolute Power of Life and Death, without consulting his Master at all. So that as Dion says the Roman Empire was subject to two supreme Governors at one and the same Time:

Οὗτω μὲν δὲ τότε ἡ τῶν Ῥωμαίων ἀρχὴ δύο Αυτοκρατορῶν ἀλλὰ ἰσχυρῶς Νερῶν καὶ Ἡλίου. Dio. Lib. lxxiii. P. 720.

<sup>2</sup> Episc. P. 28.

—<sup>1</sup> Ann. 57. Romam adductus est, & sub Cura Burrhi Prætorio Præfecti, Viri optimi, & humanitatis pleni, in libera Custodia, per biennium detinetur. Ann. 59. Carcere solutus, ad consuetum Evangelii prædicandi Munus se recepit, & sequenti-

bis

" brought to Rome, and kept a Prisoner, as it  
 " were, at large, under the Care of Burrhus the  
 " Præfectus Prætorio, who was a good-natured  
 " and humane Person. That Ann<sup>o</sup> 59 he was set  
 " at Liberty, and went about preaching the Gos-  
 " pel, as he used to do; and in the following  
 " Years he traversed Asia, Crete, and some of the  
 " Western World. At last, in the Year 63, or  
 " the Beginning of the following Year, he return-  
 " ed to Rome, and, upon the Pretext of setting  
 " Fire to that City, was beheaded there." Thus  
 far Dr. Cave. Whitby in his Chronological In-  
 dex to the New Testament, at the Year 65, says  
*about the latter End of this Year St. Paul is set*  
*at Liberty.* At 67 he says " St. Peter and St.  
 " Paul are said to have suffered Martyrdom at  
 " Rome towards the latter End of Nero's Reign."  
 The Reader will observe that he does not say that  
 same Year 67, but *towards the latter End of Nero's*  
*Reign.* And Nero killed himself in the Year 68.  
 We see from hence that Whitby allows two Years  
 and near three Quarters for St. Paul's Travels, for  
 Nero killed himself in June. But I suspect that  
 in this Index the Number 65 is put for 64; for in  
 his <sup>1</sup> Note on the last Verses of the Acts he says,  
 that in the ninth of Nero—he (St. Paul) was set at  
 Liberty. Now Nero reigned thirteen Years; if  
 therefore the Apostle was set at Liberty the ninth  
 Year, and was martyred the thirteenth Year of  
 that Prince's Reign, he must have been three  
 Years and three Quarters upon his Travels. And  
 as the Dates in his Commentary are in Words at  
 length, and in his Index in Figures only, I must  
 suspect that 65 is mistaken for 64. Especially as  
 this Account comes nearer to that given us by the  
 learned

bus Annis Asiam, Cretam, & nonnulla forsan Occidentis Loca  
 peragravit, tandem Ann. 63. vel proximi initio Romam rediit.  
<sup>1</sup> See Whitby in Acts xxviii. 30, 31.

learned Bishop of Chester. According to whom  
<sup>m</sup> Nero began his Reign the 3 Id. i. e. the thirteenth  
 of October, in the Year of our Lord 54, conse-  
 quently the ninth Year of his Reign must begin  
 the thirteenth of October 63. From thence to  
 June 68 is four Years and near three Quarters.

<sup>n</sup> St. Paul was martyred 8 Cal. Mart. or the 22d  
 of February. And it was not long between his  
 writing the second Epistle to Timothy, and his  
 Death. Therefore the Apostle could scarce be less  
 than four Years from his leaving Rome and re-  
 turning to it again; in which Time he might  
 visit many far distant Places, and preach the Gos-  
 pel in them too. And, if Mr. How will take the  
 Pains to consult <sup>o</sup> that very great Chronologer last  
 cited, he may find that the Opinion of the greater  
 Part of the Men skilled in that Science in his  
 Time were, that seven Years intervened between  
 St. Paul's first and second Imprisonment, and some  
 that there were still more. Among whom is the  
 learned Bishop Stillingfleet, who is of Opinion that  
 St. Paul employed eight Years in his last Peregrina-  
 tions, before he again returned to Rome. And  
 now the Reader will judge whether the Opinion of  
 Mr. How's nameless Chronologers, or that of these  
 three very able and learned Men, deserves most Re-  
 gard; who, though they differ in the Dates, yet  
 all agree in allowing more than three Years and a  
 half (two of them four Years) for the intervening  
 Time so often mentioned. Especially when Rea-  
 son tells us it were scarce credible that St. Paul  
 should be able to visit so many Countries, as he is  
 said to have done, and stay in them long enough to  
 preach the Gospel within the Compass of two Years.  
 And as there is no Intimation in holy Scripture

C 4

at

<sup>m</sup> Annal. Paul. Page 14. <sup>n</sup> Pearl. Ann. Paul. P. 25. <sup>o</sup> Pearl.  
 de Serie Rom<sup>m</sup>. Episc<sup>m</sup>. Cap. 9. P. 79. See Still. Orig. Brit.  
 Ed. Fo. Page 40.



at what particular Point of Time St. Paul resided at any of the Places he went to in these his last Peregrinations; so there can be no Conclusion made against Titus's spending as much Time at Crete as was necessary for him to do, as Bishop of that Island; and nevertheless have Leisure to wait upon his Master at Nicopolis, and afterwards at Rome. So that we may now presume, I hope, our Bishop of Crete to be pretty clear of the Accusation (of Non-residence). But, says Mr. How<sup>a</sup>, "Titus, (after he left St. Paul) for any Thing that appears in the New Testament, never returned there any more." We are therefore to believe nothing that is recorded in ancient History about Titus, or any one else, if it be of later Date than the sacred Writings carry us down to; for they reach no farther than St. Paul's first Imprisonment at Rome. But I am persuaded, that any unprejudiced Person will be satisfied with History compiled by Men of undoubted Veracity, and who lived near the Apostles' Times, and were sufficiently informed of the Truth of the Case, though not inspired, where sacred History leaves us. And therefore, for the Sake of such, I shall endeavour to shew, from the general Consent of all ancient Writers, that Titus was the established Bishop, or rather Metropolitan of Crete. <sup>b</sup> "Eusebius tells us, that, as Timothy was constituted the first Bishop of Ephesus, so was Titus of Crete." St. Chrysostom says, that to Titus, who was, without Doubt, an approved Person<sup>c</sup>, was committed *ολακληρος νησος, an intire Island, & τοσούτων επισκοπων κρισις, and the Jurisdiction over so many Bishops*<sup>d</sup>. So Theodoret, that he was, by

<sup>a</sup> Episc. Pag. 28.

<sup>b</sup> Τιμοθεος γαρ μην της εν Εφισω ποροικιας, μοριται πρωτος την Επισκοπην ειληχται· ως & Τίτος των εν Κρητης Εκκλησιων. Euseb. Eccles. Hist. Lib. 3. Cap. 4.

<sup>c</sup> Chrysost. in 1 it. 1. Hom. 1.

<sup>d</sup> Της μεγιστης ουσης — τους εν αυτον επισκοπους χειροτονησαι. Theod. Arg. in Epist. ad Tit.

Paul, ordained Bishop of Crete, though of very large Extent, to ordain Bishops under him. St. Jerom, in his Catalogue of Writers, tells us, that " Titus, the Bishop of Crete, preached the Gospel at Crete, and in the Islands round about it: And that he died and was buried in Crete." Here then we have the unanimous Consent of Antiquity in Proof of Titus's having been the fixed Bishop of Crete. And this, I hope, will be sufficient to satisfy all unprejudiced Persons of the Truth of the Fact. But now it is necessary to answer some of our Author's puzzling Questions, as he calls them. The first of which is, " Whether Titus was a Diocesan or Metropolitan?" If he will take the Trouble to consider the last quoted Passage of Theodoret, that will in great Measure answer his Question. And, to confirm it we have the Greek Scholiast, who says, " The Apostle left Titus to constitute Bishops, having first made him Bishop." We will add another Testimony: Theophylact tells us, that " He was entrusted with the judging and ordaining so many Bishops." All Antiquity then here tells us, that Titus had the Power of a Metropolitan committed to him; and that he did accordingly constitute Bishops, one in every City, or City by City. And it is a known Fact, that there never was above one Bishop in a City. Not but that he ordained other inferior Clergy, where it was necessary for him so to do. For the Reader will be so good as to recollect that the Word *Πρεσβυτερος* is to be rendered either Presbyter, or Bishop, as the Context requires: And there-

\* Titus Episcopus Cretæ, in eadem & in Circumjacentibus Insulis prædicavit Evangelium Christi. Ibidem autem dormivit, & sepultus est, nempe in Creta. Hieron. Catal. Script. Episc. Pag. 29. Ἀποστόλος Τίτος ἐπὶ τὸ καταστήσαι ἐπισκοποὺς κατὰ νήσους, ἐπισκοποὺς πρῶτα ποιήσας. Ὁ τοσούτοις ἐπισκοποῖν κρείσσον ἢ χυροτεροῖν πειράσθαι. Theoph.

therefore, as all Antiquity agrees, that these *Πρεσβυτεροι* were Bishops, we presume to understand it in the same Sense; and I flatter myself that all un-biassed Persons will think what I have here said sufficient to justify me in so doing; and of Consequence a proper Answer to Mr. How's Questions, viz. <sup>l</sup> "Whether Titus was a Diocesan or Metropolitan, and whether he had Orders to ordain *"* <sup>o</sup> *"*Diocesans." We will now try to resolve his other two puzzling Questions; which are, <sup>k</sup> what particular Diocese he had; and who was his Successor? Irenæus tells us <sup>l</sup>, "it would swell his *"* <sup>o</sup> *"*Book too much to enumerate the Successions *"* (of Bishops) in every Church." And a little before he says <sup>m</sup>, "We can reckon up those Bishops who were appointed to their several Churches by the Apostles; and the Successors of those Bishops, even to our Times." By this it is plain, that, at the Time Irenæus lived, there were in being, in every Church, Catalogues of their Bishops from the Days of the Apostles down to his Time; which he would have produced, if he had thought it necessary. It was known therefore, at that Time, who was Titus's Successor in the Province of Crete. And who can wonder, if after such Destruction of so many flourishing Churches; and the Loss of their Archives, of all Sorts, by Fire and otherwise; and after such unexampled Ravages committed all over the Empire, both in the East and West, by the Irruption of innumerable Barbarians: Who can wonder, I say, if, after all that, we have lost the Accounts of whole Churches, and every Thing that belonged to them?

<sup>l</sup> Episc. Pag. 29. <sup>k</sup> Ib. <sup>l</sup> Valde longum est in tali Volumine omnium Ecclesiarum enumerare Successiones. Iren. Lib. 3. Cap. 3. Ed. Grab. <sup>m</sup> Habemus annumerare eos qui ab Apostolis instituti sunt. — Episcopi in Ecclesiis, & Successores eorum usque ad nos. Iren. Lib. 3. Cap. 3.



them? But, be that as it will, it happens that I can tell Mr. How one of Titus's Successors, and that was Philip, Bishop of Gortyna, about the Year 160. To him Dionysius, Bishop of Corinth, wrote a Letter, wherein, according to Eusebius, he styled him Bishop of all the Dioceses in Crete. He wrote likewise to the Church of Gortyna, together with all the other Churches (or Dioceses) in Crete, wherein he commended Philip, their Bishop. Whereby it appears, that Philip had the Power of a Metropolitan over all the Dioceses of Crete. And what confirms this is, that, in the Epistle of the same Dionysius to the Church of Gnosus, he directs his Exhortation to Pinytus as Bishop of that particular Diocese. So that when he wrote to the Church of Gortyna, together with the other Dioceses in Crete, he mentions Philip as their Bishop; as Superintendant of all those Churches, as well as his own particular Diocese; whereas he styles Pinytus *Επισκοπον της παροιμιας*, Bishop of the Diocese. And thus I have shewn that Titus had a Successor in his own Place of Government, i. e. the Island of Crete. And if it be true, what Dr. Cave, in his Life of Titus, tells us from the Ancients, viz. that he died in the ninety-fourth Year of his Age, Philip could not be many Successions below him. And therefore we will presume that, as other Metropolitan Churches, so that of Gortyna had an immediate Successor to Titus, and so on to Philip, who was likewise followed in a regular Succession, as we find it was in all the Christian World besides. And, as to his particular Diocese, it may well be presumed to have been

Gortyna,

Και τη εκκλησια δι τη παροιμιαση Γορτυναι αμα ταις λοιταις  
κατα Κρητην παροιμιας επισημιας, Φιλίππου επισκοπου αυτου αποδεχ-  
ται. Euseb. Lib. 4. Cap. 23. ° Αλλη σφραγισματα προς  
Κωνσταντου επισημια, η η Πρωτον της παροιμιας επισκοπου παρακαλει.  
lb. Pag. 186. Ed. Read.

Gortyna, both from Eusebius's Manner of speaking, in the Passage before cited, and because it was the capital City of that Island. Cellarius calls it "a famous City, and sometimes the principal City." And "Tournefort tells us, from Strabo, that after the Decadence of Gnoſſus, which the Romans made it their Buſineſs to humble, Gortyna became the moſt puiſſant City of Crete." And it is a known Fact, that the Dioceſes and Provinces in the Church were always conformable to the Cities and Provinces of the State; and where the Governor of a Province reſided, which was in the capital City, in that was placed a Metropolitan, whoſe Jurisdiction in the Church extended over as many Dioceſes, as that of the Governor did over Cities in his Province. There is then the greateſt Probability that Titus's own particular Dioceſe was the City and Territory of Gortyna. For every City had a certain Tract of Land about it, over which the Power of the Governor in the State, and that of the Biſhop in the Church, always extended. As to our Author's laſt Queſtion, i. e. "Why he (Titus) had no Orders to ordain Dioceſans?" it is very little to the Purpoſe, becauſe the Word *Πρεσβυτερος* includes in its Signification all the Orders of the Clergy; as I ſhall ſhew by and by. But, it ſeems, we muſt produce a Text out of Scripture to prove that Titus was generally Reſident at Crete, after the Apoſtle left him there. Now, if we be right as to the Time when the Apoſtle is ſuppoſed to have ſettled Titus in that Province; ſuch a Demand muſt be to little Purpoſe, becauſe the Hiſtory of the Acts does not extend ſo far. And no Account of any particular Tranſactions can be expected

<sup>p</sup> Cellar. Geog. Vol. 1. Pag. 321.      <sup>q</sup> Tournefort, Vol. 1. Pag. 62. from Strabo, Lib. 10.      <sup>r</sup> Episc. Pag. 29.      <sup>s</sup> Ib. Pag. 27.

pected in a History which leaves off at a Period short of the Time wherein they happened. And therefore an unprejudiced Person will be content with Accounts transmitted to us by honest and faithful Writers, in Cases where sacred History fails us. So that although St. Paul does not expressly say, as we would do at this Time of the Day, that he constituted and ordained Timothy Bishop of Ephesus, or Titus Bishop of Crete, in so many Words; yet, as all the ancient Writers, that must know, unanimously agree, that they were actually Bishops of those two Dioceses, we only want to be informed of the Time when they were so constituted; and that we find was when St. Paul beseeched the one to abide still at Ephesus, and left the other at Crete, with episcopal Authority. But if St. Paul had actually worded it so as to have styled these two holy Men, the *Αποστολοι* of Ephesus and Crete, Mr. How would not have believed they were so. For the Apostle actually tells the Philippians, that Epaphroditus was their Apostle, with a Character that appears to me not to be much inferior to what is said of Timothy and Titus. Yet, says the Apostle, “ I supposed it necessary to send to you  
 “ Epaphroditus, my Brother and Companion in  
 “ Labour, and Fellow Soldier, but your Messenger (or Apostle) and he that ministred unto my  
 “ Wants; for he longed after you all, and was  
 “ full of Heaviness, because ye had heard that he  
 “ had been sick—Receive him therefore in the  
 “ Lord with all Gladness; and hold such in Reputation: Because, for the Work of Christ, he was  
 “ nigh unto Death, not regarding his Life to supply  
 “ your Lack of Service towards me.” Now, what can Timothy or Titus, or any Man else, do more than

\* Phil. ii. 25, 26, 29, 30.



than sacrifice their Lives for the Gospel, or for the Service of their Master, as Epaphroditus seems to have done for St. Paul? And I shall not scruple to place Clement, Polycarp, Ignatius, and many more holy Men and Martyrs of those Times, in the same high Rank and Character in the Church, as Timothy, or Titus, or any other. Neither do I doubt but Timothy and Titus had the Power of working Miracles, though we are not told so in express Words. And the same I believe of Ignatius and Polycarp, and Hundreds more, agreeably to what our Lord told his Disciples after he arose from the dead, of the *Signs that were to follow those that should believe*, although they were not in such high Stations and Characters as these particular Persons just mentioned. For our Author quite mistakes the Thing when he says that those two Persons “were possessed of miraculous Powers suited to their Eminence of Character and Office.” For the having Power to work Miracles did not exalt a Man’s personal Character, because they were given him, not upon his own Account, but to enable him the more easily to convert the Heathens to the Christian Faith. And to this agrees our Apostle, who blamed the Corinthians for coveting preternatural Gifts; bidding them, if they would covet, to <sup>2</sup> covet the best Gifts, i. e. those Christian Graces and Virtues which were of great Price in the Sight of God, and would procure them a high Rank and Place in the Kingdom of Heaven. Whereas the Gift of Miracles served not to enhance the Character of him that had it; but for the more easy Conversion of Unbelievers. For that even Judas, who, as our Lord himself tells us, was a Thief, and kept the Bag; yet he was endued with the Power of working Miracles as well as the other eleven,

<sup>1</sup> Mark xvi. 17, 18, 19.

<sup>2</sup> Episc. P. 32.

<sup>3</sup> 1 Cor. xii.

eleven, when our Lord sent them out; for, if he had not, I guess we should have heard of it. But as to Timothy and Titus Mr. How is willing to agree they were of a different and superior Order to others; for, says he, <sup>1</sup> “who ever said that Timothy and Titus had the same Office with the stated Pastors of particular Churches?” Now let me but insert the *Word Bishops* instead of Pastors, and I will venture to say that the whole Body of Christian Writers, ancient and modern, except some few in these our latter Days, have always declared that the Christian Church was ever governed by single Persons endued with all Powers necessary for the Time and Place they lived in, who were the Apostles Successors. Nay even Mr. How's favourite Author, Mr. Baxter, insists upon it that there must always be in the Church such Officers or Superintendants as Timothy and Titus were. For those Sort of Bishops that Mr. Baxter allows to be of divine Institution, <sup>2</sup> “are such, says he, as succeed the Apostles in the ordinary Part of Church Government; while some senior Pastors have the supervising Care of many Churches (as the Visitors had in Scotland) and are so far Episcopi Episcoporum, and Archbishops, having no constraining Power of the Sword, but a Power to admonish and instruct the Pastors, and to regulate Ordinations, Synods, and all great and common Circumstances that belong to Churches; for if one Form of Government, in which some Pastors had such extensive Work and Power (as Timothy, Titus, and Evangelists, as well as Apostles, had) we must not change it without Proof, that Christ himself would have it changed” And agreeably to all this, says Spotswood, <sup>3</sup> “The Superintendants held

<sup>1</sup> Episc. P. 29.

<sup>2</sup> Baxter's Church History, Sect. 60.

<sup>3</sup> Spotswood's History of the Church of Scotland, P. 258.

“ held their Office during Life ; and their Power  
 “ was episcopal ; for they did elect and ordain Mi-  
 “ nisters ; they presided in Synods, and directed  
 “ all Church Censures ; neither was any Excom-  
 “ munication pronounced without their Warrant.”

What then does Baxter say in all this, but that there always was and always must be in the Christian Church some such Officers as Timothy and Titus were ; and that by the Institution of Christ himself ? And what are those Officers, so like Timothy and Titus, but Bishops and Archbishops ? For what is this supervising many Churches, but governing a Diocese wherein were many Parishes ? And, if a Diocesan Bishop be contrary to Scripture, how comes a Scotch Superintendant to be agreeable to it ? And, as to the regulating Ordinations, that, in Scripture Phrase, is the same with ordaining Elders in every City. Especially as these Superintendants <sup>b</sup> had their Residence fixed, and their Diocese too ; and their Office was for Life, and their Practice was altogether the same with that of Diocesan Episcopacy. So that, according to Mr. Baxter, there must always be in the Christian Church a Set of Men in the same Capacity as Timothy and Titus were in the Churches of Ephesus and Crete. What Mr. How says of St. Paul's Companions may be very true for aught I know, if we except the Time when he settled them in their particular Province ; but he is in an Error, as it appears to me, when he tells us that <sup>c</sup> “ St. Paul's Commission would not allow him ordinarily to stay  
 “ long in a Place.” For we do not find but that our Apostle, where a sufficient Door was opened unto him, would readily stay long enough <sup>d</sup>. He staid a whole Year at Antioch when he first went thither. <sup>e</sup> He continued a long Time at Iconium.

<sup>b</sup> Spotswood, P. 158.

<sup>c</sup> Episc. P. 31.

<sup>d</sup> Acts xi. 26.

<sup>e</sup> Acts xiv. 3.



Iconium. \* At his Return to Antioch he abode long Time with his Disciples. † At Corinth he staid a Year and a Half before he was apprehended; and, after he was released, he tarried there yet a good While. ‡ At Ephesus he staid three Years. Remember (says he to the Elders at Miletum) *that by the Space of three Years, I ceased not to warn every one Night and Day with Tears.* We see then that our Apostle's Commission allowed him to stay long enough, where there was a Prospect of making many Converts. But if he did leave any newly-planted Church, and but a little while after he had first preached the Gospel to them; it was from urgent Necessity, or by Force. He returned back to them as soon as he could, and settled Priests and Deacons amongst them: For himself was their Bishop, until he had constituted another over them. So when he was drove from Lystra, by the Persecution of the Jews, he went to Derbe: <sup>n</sup> *And when they had preached the Gospel to that City, and had taught many, they returned again to Lystra, and Iconium, and Antioch. — And when they had ordained them Elders in every Church, and had prayed with Fasting, they commended them unto the Lord in whom they believed.* St. Paul's Custom, then, was to ordain Elders wherever he went, before he left them for any Time. And, for the same Reason, I suppose that he ordained some Elders himself before he left Crete, as his Custom had always been. And, when his Affairs called him away, he left Titus with Power to ordain Elders, as Occasion should require, and to dispose and settle such Things there as the Apostle, by the Shortness of his Stay, omitted to settle. For he had not Time to do in Crete, as Clemens Alexandrinus tells us St. John did in Asia, after his

D

\* Acts xiv. 28.  
xiv. 21, 23.

† Ib. xi. 18.

‡ Ib. xx. 31.

<sup>n</sup> Ib.

his Return from Patmos<sup>1</sup>; "when he went and  
 "visited the neighbouring Nations, in some  
 "Places ordaining Bishops; in others, forming or  
 "composing intire new Churches; in others, or-  
 "daining inferior Clergy, such as were signified  
 "to him by the Holy Spirit." But St. Paul, af-  
 ter he had preached, and made many Converts,  
 left the Forming of the several Churches, or Dio-  
 ceses, and supplying them each with a regular Bo-  
 dy of Clergy, to Titus, whilst he himself went to  
 other Places where he was more wanted. And so  
 says Theodoret<sup>2</sup>: "That the Apostle, after he  
 "had laid the Foundations of the Christian Re-  
 "ligion, left to the thrice blessed Titus what re-  
 "mained, in order to the full Settlement of those  
 "Churches." And that was Part of the τα λειποντα,  
 or Things omitted to be done by St. Paul himself.  
 A little farther on, our Author gives us to under-  
 stand, that St. Paul enjoins Timothy to *do the*  
*Work of an Evangelist*; and from thence concludes  
 that Timothy could not have any fixed Charge; be-  
 cause the Evangelists were Persons that had only a  
 "general and unfixed Ministry. But we do not read  
 of any Evangelist, who had no other Commission  
 than that of an Evangelist, and yet exercised the  
 Power that Timothy and Titus were invested with:  
 For then mere Deacons might have ordained and  
 governed Priests. For Philip the Evangelist was  
 a Deacon. And it is most certain, that he never  
 pretended to any such Authority. Thus<sup>3</sup>, when  
 in the Execution of his Office as an Evangelist  
 (whose Duty it was to preach the Gospel to Un-  
 believers)

<sup>1</sup> Λοιπὸν παρακαλοῦμεν, καὶ σὺ τα εὐαγγελιστὰς τῶν ἐθνῶν, οὓων  
 εἰς ἐπισκοποὺς καταστήσῃ, οὓων δὲ ὅλας ἐκκλησίας ἀνοίσῃ, οὓων  
 δὲ κληρὸν ἢ καὶ γὰρ τινα κληρώσῃ. ὑπὸ τοῦ ἀποστόλου σημαίνοντο.  
 Clem. Alex. Vol. 1. Pag. 959. Ed. Pott.

<sup>2</sup> Τα δὲ τῆς ἐνορίας  
 καταστήσας θιμίλια, τῷ τριστάκτῳ Τίτῳ τῆς λοιπῆς οἰκουμένης ἐπι-  
 τρέψῃ. Theod. Arg. in Tit. <sup>3</sup> 2 Tim. iv. 5. <sup>4</sup> Episc.

P. 32. <sup>5</sup> Acts viii. 5, &c.

lievers) he had converted a great many at Samaria, and baptised them; he did not pretend to confirm them by the laying on of his Hands, or to settle any Clergy amongst them; but he gave Notice of what Success he had to the Apostles; and they sent two of their own Order to Samaria, that they might do what was necessary to be done in that Case, and was out of Philip's Power. So that, if Timothy and Titus were to be considered as mere Evangelists, they could have no Authority to ordain Presbyters, or govern Churches, as the one did that of Ephesus, and the other that of Crete. When therefore the Word Evangelist is applied to Persons in such high Office and Authority as those two great Men were, it is to be understood of that Part of their Office which consisted in preaching the Gospel; it being the Duty of a Bishop to preach the Gospel, as well as those of the inferior Orders. For although a Prophet, or an Evangelist, or Doctor, or Teacher, was not an Apostle or Bishop; yet an Apostle or Bishop had all those Offices centered in him. A Presbyter, or Deacon, is no Apostle; but an Apostle is both Presbyter and Deacon together with his Apostleship. I cannot but observe in this Place, how artfully Mr. How lays before the Reader these two Offices of Apostle and Prophet, in such a Manner as to make them pass for one and the same; only expressed by different Words; as sometimes is usual in holy Scripture. He says<sup>r</sup>, that Christ gave to his Church Apostles and Prophets; that is, says he, inspired Teachers; that's all, without any farther Inquiry. But St. Paul says<sup>r</sup>, that Christ gave some Apostles, and some Prophets; making a Difference. And, what that Difference is, he tells us in another Place; where he says, that

D 2

God

• Episc. Pa. 32.

• Ephes. iv. 11.



God hath set some in the Church, first Apostles, secondarily Prophets, &c. hereby shewing that the first were of a superior Order to the second; which Mr. How endeavours to keep out of Sight as much as he can, saying they were inspired Teachers, and no more. Whereas the latter were only Teachers; but the former were Teachers and Governors too: And this makes a wide Difference. But we are told, that "in the Πρεσβυτεροι or Επισκοποι, in these alone we must look for the full Powers of the Christian Ministry." I must here beg the Reader to carry in Mind with him, as he goes along, what I have before proved, and shall still farther prove in the Sequel, viz. that the Word Πρεσβυτερος is sometimes understood in Scripture to mean a Bishop, in our Sense of the Word, as well as a Presbyter or Deacon, and therefore it is of too vague a Signification to determine any Thing upon, farther than that, in the Acts of the Apostles and the following Books of the New Testament, it is generally put for a Person in holy Orders; but for what Degree of holy Orders must be determined from other Considerations in the several Places where it occurs. And, as to the Word Επισκοπος, I shall at present only say (with Bishop Hoadley) "that Ordination (and the Government of the Church) appear to have been always in the Hands of Officers superior to those called, at that Time, επισκοποι." And therefore we are not to look for the full Powers of the standing Christian Ministry in these two Words. And so this last Paragraph of Mr. How's need not touch us to the Quick. But he now asks a Question: "When, says he, they had fulfilled this Service, and well settled these Churches, and were gone again, who was to do these Things then?"

† Episc. Pag. 34.  
 † Episc. Pag. 35.

\* Hoad. on Episc. Ord. Pag. 404.

“ then ? ” I answer, the Bishops their Successors. But why not Presbyters ? I answer, Because Presbyters were not of that Order and Degree which was entrusted with the Government of the Church. And because there is no one Text to be found in the New Testament, which proves that they who were in Scripture called Bishops or Overseers, were called to the Office of ordaining others ; or that any Church Officers which answered to those since peculiarly called Presbyters, ever so much as assisted, in those Times, at an Ordination ; much less were the sole Managers of that Affair<sup>1</sup>. And there is no Instance of a Presbyter’s having the Power of Ordination from the Times of the Apostles down to the Reformation. All which the Reader may see effectually proved in Bishop Hoadley’s Defence of Episcopal Ordination. “ Mr. Forster had asserted, that there were many Presbyters in Ephesus and Crete before Timothy and Titus were fixed there by St. Paul. In Answer to this, Mr. How, with all Christian Meekness, asks, “ *Who told you so ?* adding withal, that *this was a bold Question*. Be it so ; then I must be so bold as to answer it. In the first Place then, I say that the Apostle always<sup>2</sup> ordained Elders in every Church where he planted or preached the Gospel. Therefore, as to Timothy, there must have been many Presbyters in Ephesus before he was fixed in that See ; St. Paul having preached there for three Years together, and converted most of that City, and almost all Asia besides. And, as to Titus, it is, upon the same Account, reasonable to think, that the Apostle ordained some Elders before he left Crete ; and, as his Preaching was attended with the<sup>3</sup> Demonstration of the Spirit and of Power, the Converts he made must be very numerous in a very little Time :

D 3

And

<sup>1</sup> Hoad, on Episc. Pag. 404.<sup>2</sup> Animad. Pag. 89, 90.<sup>3</sup> Episc. P. 36.<sup>4</sup> Acts xiv. 23.<sup>5</sup> 1 Cor. ii. 4.

And of Consequence more Teachers would be necessary. So when St. Paul left the Island, because Converts were daily increasing, Disorders arising which must be corrected, and the Preachers of false Doctrine to be silenced, and other Irregularities to be stopped by Censure, and the like ; and more and more Elders of every Degree to be ordained ; there would still be Occasion, which would continue for ever, that Titus, or one of the same Order with him, should reside there ; as we see has been the Case from that Time down to this Day. It must be observed, that the whole Strength of Mr. How's Argument lies in confining the Meaning of the Word *Πρεσβυτερος* to the Degree of, what we now call, Presbyter ; which I hope, by this Time, appears to be a great Mistake, as I shall still farther prove by and by : And, if so, our Author's Reasoning, for several Pages together, falls to the Ground. But he grants, however <sup>a</sup>, “ that there were Preachers  
 “ there (at Ephesus) and many if you please ; for  
 “ it seems to me (says he) that the good People  
 “ at that Time of Day did frequently perform  
 “ this Office out of Christian Friendship and  
 “ Zeal.” Now the Friendship and Zeal of the primitive Christians I do not at all dispute ; but that they publicly taught in the Church, and had no Authority for so doing, but Friendship and Zeal, is what I utterly deny ; because St. Paul represents the Matter quite otherwise. He tells us <sup>a</sup>, that “ *there are Diversities of Gifts, but the same Spirit* : And that to one is given, by the Spirit, the  
 “ *Word of Wisdom ; to another the Word of Know-*  
 “ *ledge by the same Spirit ; to another, Faith by the*  
 “ *same Spirit ; to another, the Gifts of Healing by*  
 “ *the same Spirit ; to another the Working of Mira-*  
 “ *cles, to another Prophecy, to another Discerning of*  
 “ *Spirits ;*

<sup>a</sup> Episc. Pag. 36.

<sup>a</sup> 1 Cor. xii. 4. 8, 9, 10, 11.



“ *Spirits ; to another divers Kinds of Tongues ; to another the Interpretation of Tongues. But all these worketh that one and the self-same Spirit, dividing to every Man severally as he will.*” So that, according to St. Paul, these Preachers did not take upon them to preach the Gospel, without an immediate Commission from the Holy Ghost, from whom they had those spiritual Gifts. Therefore, whatever Friendship and Zeal they might have, they did not presume, upon the Strength of that, to speak in the Church ; but were particularly inspired by the Holy Spirit, when they exerted those spiritual Gifts of Prophesying, speaking with Tongues, and other Gifts mentioned by St. Paul. But that those plentiful and extraordinary Gifts of the Holy Spirit were not to continue long in the Church, is plain from St. Paul’s ordaining Elders in every Church where he planted and preached the Gospel ; and because those that had such Gifts were often puffed up with Pride, and created great Confusion in the Church ; as is manifest from what we read throughout the whole fourteenth Chapter. But, says Mr. How, “ they preached thus without pretending to that indelible Character that has since been conferred by certain ecclesiastical Orders.” Here is a Fling at the Christian Priesthood. But the candid Reader will, I hope, excuse me, if I say that our Author, by these Words, shews that he understands not what he says, nor whereof he affirms. He does not seem to know what an indelible Character is : Therefore I will inform him. By an indelible Character then we understand such a Character, as whoever once takes upon him, cannot lay aside without being guilty of a grievous Sin. And so he that by Baptism has listed himself under Christ’s

D 4

Banner,

Banner, has an indelible Character stamp'd upon him; i. e. That of Christ's faithful Soldier and Servant unto his Life's End; for, if he flies from his Colours, and forsakes the Captain of his Salvation, and casts his Saviour and his Words behind him, we call him an Apostate: And he runs great Hazard of being finally ruined; because *he crucifies to himself the Son of God afresh, and puts him to an open Shame*, as says St. Paul. Thus he that enters into the more immediate Service of Christ, by taking holy Orders, puts on another Character, i. e. a Minister of Christ; which, as the great Hooker observes, "they must not think to put on and off, like a Cloak, as the Weather serveth; to take it, reject and resume it as oft as themselves list; of which profane and impious Contempt these later Times have yielded, as of all other Kinds of Iniquity and Apostacy, strange Examples: But let them know, which put their Hands to this Plough, that, once consecrated to God, they are made his peculiar Inheritance for ever. Suspensions may stop, and Degradations utterly cut off the Use or Exercise of Power before given; but, voluntarily, it is not in the Power of Man to separate and pull asunder what God by his Authority coupleth. So that although there may be, through Misdesert, Degradation, as there may be Cause of just Separation after Matrimony; yet, if (as sometimes it doth) Restitution to former Dignity, or Reconciliation after Breach, doth happen, neither doth the one or the other ever iterate the first Knot." Will there not then be a Reason (and a good one too, if he can find it) required at his Hands, who rejects that high Honour of being in the more immediate Service of his

<sup>d</sup> Heb. iv. 6.

<sup>e</sup> Hook. Eccles. Pol. Book 5. Sect. 77.

his most gracious Redeemer? What! is Christ's Service a hard Service? Does he insist upon unreasonable Terms? Is the Business he puts his Servants upon too laborious? Is he a rigid and severe Taskmaster? Or is it possible that any Servant of his should find good Reason to grow weary of his Service? It is not possible to entertain even the least Thought that any one of these foregoing Particulars can ever happen to be the Case. What a Disgrace and Affront then must that Man put upon his heavenly Master, who, having once entered upon Christ's Service, afterwards deserts him, and refuses to continue his Servant any longer? I wish he may not run a great Hazard of coming short, at last, of the Kingdom of God. Our divine Master himself has told us<sup>f</sup>, that *no Man, having put his Hand to the Plough, and looking back, is fit for the Kingdom of God.* And a Case directly in Point is that of St. Paul, as he himself represents it. *Though, says he, I preach the Gospel, I have nothing to glory of; for Necessity is laid upon me; yea, Wo is unto me if I preach not the Gospel. For if I do this Thing willingly, I have a Reward; but if against my Will, a Dispensation of the Gospel is committed unto me.* And what is all this but saying that he had an indelible Character stamp'd upon him; which was that of a Minister of Christ, and which he could not forego, but with his Life? *A Necessity, says he, is laid upon me, yea, Wo is unto me if I preach not the Gospel.* And why so? Because a Dispensation of the Gospel was committed unto him. So that whether it were with a good Will or no; yet, preach the Gospel he must as long as he was able; for that Wo would be unto him if he threw up his Commission. Now, if such was St. Paul's Case, the same is the Case of every Person to whom is committed a Dispensation of the Gospel;

<sup>f</sup> Luke ix. 62.      § 1 Cor. ix. 16, 17.



Gospel : And I humbly presume it matters not whether that Dispensation be to the Office of Deacon, or Presbyter, or Bishop, for all three are equally Servants of Christ ; all three have equally the Necessity of preaching the Gospel laid upon them. It would then behove those Persons who have been admitted to the Office of Deacon in the Church of Christ, and have, or do now entertain any Thoughts of laying down the Office, and turning Laymen ; I say, it would behove them much to consider well what St. Paul here says of himself, before they actually leave our blessed Lord and Master's Service ; and whether in so doing they may not run themselves in Danger of that Wo, which our Apostle says would be unto him, if he ever should lay aside preaching the Gospel. But to return, " Mr. How says that it was with a " View to these Men, and not any Presbyters of " the Church (that is, those false Teachers of " whom he had been speaking for two or three " Pages) that St. Paul left Timothy at Ephesus." If Timothy was sent to Ephesus upon Account express of these false Teachers, it must have been because that, from the high Dignity and Power annexed to his Order, he would have more Influence over these false Teachers, than the ordinary Presbyters could have, from the Degree they held in the Church. They could persuade and exhort only ; he could persuade and exhort, and charge and command too. <sup>1</sup> Timothy could stop their Mouths *ἐπιστομαζειν*, by his Censures, Suspension, or Excommunication, if necessary ; as St. Paul commands Titus to do. And then, when they are cut off from the Church, they might preach what they pleased, as the Jews and Heathens did who preached Christ out of Strife and Contention ; with whom the Bishops of the Church, as Governors, had no Concern.

<sup>1</sup> Episc. P. 38.

<sup>1</sup> 1 Tim. iv. 11. and v. 7.

Concern. Now the Business of the Presbyters was then, as it is now, to admonish, preach, and exhort. They might and ought to endeavour to persuade these People, or any Body else, not to preach false Doctrine: But to charge and command them not to do it; to stop their Mouths, and silence them, was not in their Power, and so no Part of their Duty. Acts of Government and Discipline were reserved for Timothy and Titus, with other like Persons, and their Successors, who were placed by the Apostles, either mediately or immediately, in Posts of that high Dignity. And these Words παραγγελλειν, which signifies to command, and επισημαζειν, which signifies to silence, are never used by the sacred Writers when they are speaking of the Duty of the επισκοποι, or πρεσβυτεροι, of the inferior Degrees, whom the Scripture calls πρεσβυτεροι. But, from our Translators having rendered this last Word by ruling, Mr. How would conclude that all Government and Discipline of the Church was put into the Hands of those who, in our Translation, are said to *rule well*. But, if we look into the Scripture, and there see what was the Business of these *Rulers*, we shall not find that they had any Concern at all with the Government of the Church. Those Persons whom we translate *Rulers*, are described in Scripture by two Words, Επισκοπος and ηγουμενος. Let us see then what the Scripture says of their Business. St. Paul, in his Epistle to the Hebrews, says <sup>1</sup>, *Remember them which have the Rule over you, who have spoken unto you the Word of God; whose Faith follow, considering the End of their Conversation.* And, a little farther on, our Apostle reminds them again <sup>2</sup>: *Obey them, says he, that have the Rule over you* (ηγουμενοι, your Governors, or rather Guides, according to Dr. Whitby) *and submit yourselves. For they watch for*  
your

<sup>1</sup> Heb. xiii. 7.

<sup>2</sup> Ib. xiii. 17.

*your Souls, as they that must give an Account.* Which Dr. Whitby thus paraphrases<sup>1</sup>: “Obey them that  
 “ have the Rule over you, and submit yourselves  
 “ to their godly Admonitions, for they watch for  
 “ your Souls, as they that must give an Account  
 “ to God for them, that they may do it with Joy  
 “ in the Presence of Christ, that they have gained  
 “ you to him, and built you up in your Faith; and  
 “ not with Grief, that they could not prevail up-  
 “ on you to live suitably to their Instructions.”

The Method then these *ηγουμενοι* ruled by was preaching the Word of God, Admonition and Exhortation only; without the least Power of Government and Discipline whatever. Let us now consider who these *προεσμενοι* were. In the first Epistle to Timothy, St. Paul says thus<sup>m</sup>: *Let the Elders that rule well be counted worthy of double Honour, especially they who labour in the Word and Doctrine.* And, in his first Epistle to the Thessalonians, he says<sup>n</sup>, *And we beseech you, Brethren, to know them which labour among you, and are over you in the Lord, and admonish you; and to esteem them very highly in Love for their Works sake.* Now let the impartial Reader compare these two Passages of Scripture, and see whether he can find the most distant Hint of those *Προεσμενοι* having the least Share of Church Government in their Hands. Here are no Orders given to them to charge and command; no Orders to silence and stop the Mouths of those who preached false Doctrine. No Commission to ordain. In short, here are no Orders or Licence for these Presbyters to do any Act peculiar to the episcopal Office. So that the Word *Ruling* means ruling by Preaching, Exhortation, and Admonition; as the inferior Clergy are called Rectors of Parishes, but no otherwise than by preaching, &c. and as far

<sup>1</sup> in Loc.

<sup>m</sup> 1 Tim. v. 17.

<sup>n</sup> 1 Thess. v. 12, 13,



far as their own Example will go. But it seems, St. Paul had no Regard to the ordaining of Presbyters, when he settled Timothy at Ephesus. How then came he to be so particular in his Injunctions to Timothy singly, about the Qualifications of the Persons he was to ordain? For, if his Presbyters were ever to have the Power of Ordination in themselves, Timothy must have had it in Charge to give the like Injunctions to the Presbyters, but there is not the least Hint they were ever to be concerned in those Acts; the Execution of which was confined to the single Person of Timothy, as their Apostle or Bishop. But Timothy alone it was, who had in Charge to<sup>p</sup> inhibit heretodox Preachers<sup>q</sup>; to receive Accusations against criminous Elders; to lay Hands suddenly on no Man<sup>r</sup>; not to prefer one before the other, and to do nothing by Partiality. Thus we see the Power of Church Government is confined to the single Person of Timothy. And from hence proceeds an Argument against the Opposers of Episcopacy, which I do not see how they will be able to get rid of. And it is this: If the Body of Presbyters that were in the Church of Ephesus, when Timothy was besought to abide there, of whom scarce any Man ever doubted but Mr. How; if they had it in their Power to do all those Particulars, which St. Paul enjoins Timothy, then were it fruitless, and a great misapplying of his Time, to spend it amongst them that did not want him; and where a Church was fully established already; instead of propagating the Christian Faith among the Unbelievers, and enlarging the Borders of Christ's Kingdom. And the same may be said of Titus. It appears from hence, to me, so plain, that the Churches of Ephesus and Crete had Occasion for Persons

<sup>p</sup> Episc. P. 38.

<sup>q</sup> 1 Tim. i. 3.

<sup>r</sup> Ib. v. 19.

<sup>s</sup> Ib.

v. 27. <sup>t</sup> Ib.

Persons endued with such Powers that were necessary, and yet not imparted to the inferior Clergy, such as Timothy and Titus enjoyed, as nothing can be more. And therefore Mr. Baxter was in the right, when he asserted that there would always be wanting such Men in the Church, as Timothy and Titus, for the beforementioned Purposes. These <sup>1</sup> Πρεσβυτεροι then, and Επισκοποι, or Elders of Ephesus, were the stated presiding Ministers, to whose Conduct and Guidance the Church was committed; but only for Admonition and Instruction; and not for Government or Discipline. And particularly as to the Word Επισκοπος, the true Meaning of it is no other than an Inspector or Overseer, and in the New Testament a spiritual Overseer, not unlike that faithful and wise Steward whom his Lord will make Ruler over his Household, to give them their Portion of Meat in due Season. For it is certain that our Lord, in this Place, alludes to his Clergy that were to feed their Flocks by Preaching and Instruction at proper Seasons. And, by the Way, here is another Ruler, who had no farther Commission than to give his Lord's Household their Portion of Meat in due Season. But it seems, the OEconomy, Discipline, &c. of the Church of Ephesus was committed to these *επισκοποι*. " Timothy soon leaving them, and no other Episcopus Pastorum being appointed in his Place, the Apostle also soon after, taking his final Leave of them, committed the Church wholly to their ministerial Care." But this is false in fact; for Timothy was at Miletum, at the Time St. Paul took his Leave of them, and, for aught appears, continued there till St. Paul arrived at Rome; and there is Reason to think that Timothy did not get thither till some Time after St. Paul, because the Epistle to the Ephesians, which was

<sup>1</sup> Episc. P. 40.

<sup>2</sup> Luke xii. 42.

<sup>3</sup> Episc. P. 41.

was wrote from Rome, has not Timotheus joined with him in the Inscription, as the other three have. But this Objection has no Place<sup>b</sup>; if the Time I have fixed for Timothy's Abiding at Ephesus be right. Mr. How will likewise have it, that the Word *Feed* the Church of God includes all the Parts of the pastoral Office, and the Plenitude of episcopal Power, as far as there is any Grant for it in Scripture. But this wants Proof; and I deny it; for there is a great Deal of Difference between Food and Physick; and Government and Discipline is not Food but Physick. Food is requisite every Day; but Physick is to be used sparingly, as Occasion shall require. In like Manner, Prayer, Preaching, and Instruction, is the constant Food of Men's Souls; but Correction and Discipline is their Physick, to be applied when necessary. The ordinary Presbyters therefore can administer daily Food only; but it belongs to the episcopal Office alone to administer Food and Physick too. It is the Duty of the inferior Clergy *προϊστασθαι*, to preside, each over his particular Flock; but it is the Bishop that can *παραγγελλειν*, and *επισκομιζειν*, charge and command, rebuke with all<sup>c</sup> Authority; silence and stop the Mouths of false Preachers. But I had almost overlooked another Text Mr. How produces in Proof of his Point. St. Paul *"having required it, says he, as a necessary Qualification of a Bishop (or Presbyter) that he should rule well his own House, he adds, for, if a Man knows not how to rule his own House, how shall he take Care of the Church of God? By which it appears, that the Economy, Discipline, and good Order of the Church was committed to these επισκοποι."* But let us have the whole Context: This

<sup>b</sup> See before Pag. 33.

<sup>c</sup> Episc. Pag. 44.

<sup>d</sup> *Μητα*

*παιδης επιταγης.* Cum omni Imperio, Tit. ii. 15.  
P. 41.

<sup>e</sup> Episc.



This Bishop then, or Presbyter, must *rule well his own House, having his Children in Subjection with all Gravity*; for, if a Man knows not how to rule his own House, how shall he take Care of the Church of God? In the first Place I would observe, that the Word here rendered *rule* is, in the Original, *προ-  
κατασθεναι*, and what Sort of Ruling that means, we have seen before. Secondly, That the Apostle does not say, *How shall he govern the Church?* but *How shall he take Care of the Church?* *ἐπιμε-  
νησεται*; a Word which carries with it not the least Idea of Government whatever. And, lastly, that, if this Text proves any Thing, it proves too much; for, within the Distance of two or three Verses, the very same Qualifications are required of Deacons. *Let, says St. Paul, the Deacons be the Husbands of one Wife, ruling their Children and their own Houses well.* Now the same Word is used here, in the Original, for ruling, as in the Place which concerns the Presbyters, which is *προκατασθεναι*. Therefore, according to our Author, the Apostle having required it as a necessary Qualification of a Deacon, that *he should rule well his own House*, it appears that the OEconomy, Discipline, and good Order of the Church was committed to these *Διακοναι*. This Consequence is so plain, that there needs no farther Reflection upon it, than to observe, that the main Support our dissenting Brethren have for their Cause is a mistaken Interpretation of the Words of Scripture, which is, at the same Time, in direct Opposition to the unanimous Declaration and Practice of all Antiquity. We have then, I hope, found in Scripture an Order of Men, called Bishops, or Presbyters, whose Business it was to preach to their several Flocks; and exhort them, agreeably to the Injunctions of their Superiors. Our Author, in the next Place, proceeds to con- sider

sider the Meaning of the Word Ἀγγελος. And here it is acknowledged, that <sup>a</sup> “ these Angels “ were Persons set over those several Churches, “ and endowed with spiritual Authority and “ Jurisdiction, whose Office was always to continue in the Church.” And this is all we want ; for it is plain from what is written in the second Chapter of the Revelations, that there were but <sup>a</sup> seven Angels belonging to the seven Cities ; for each City had one only. Our Lord writes to the Angel of the Church of Ephesus ; and to the Angel of the Church of Smyrna, and so on. These Cities therefore had each one single Angel that had spiritual Authority and Jurisdiction over his particular City. Now I give Mr. How, or any Body else, my free Leave to call the Place over which this single Angel had spiritual Authority and Jurisdiction Πολις, Παροικια, Διοικησις, the City, Parish, Diocese, or what else he pleases : And he may call that single Person Ἀγγελος, Ἀποστολος, Πρεσβυτερος, or Διακονος, i. e. Angel, Apostle, Presbyter, or Deacon, as St. Paul frequently styles himself ; or by any other Name he pleases, as long as it is acknowledged, that he had all the spiritual Jurisdiction and Authority over that whole City centered in his single Person alone. But, it seems, all this Argumentation is set aside with great Ease. For, <sup>a</sup> says Mr. How, “ If any Body should be “ ill-natured enough to ask you, whether they exercised this spiritual Authority, as Diocesans, over “ several Churches and their Pastors, or only as the “ Προσ-ωτοι Πρεσβυτεροι of single independent Congregations ? This, it seems, is out of your Province, “ and we must seek Satisfaction elsewhere.” Let us see then if we cannot satisfy the Reader that there must have been of Necessity more Congregations

E

than

<sup>a</sup> Episc. Pag. 45.<sup>a</sup> Rev. ii. 1, 8.<sup>a</sup> Episc. P. 46.

than one, in that great City of Ephesus, or Smyrna, &c. which, in spiritual Affairs, were subject, each to its several Angel. In the Charge against St. Paul by Demetrius, this Silversmith says to his Countrymen <sup>k</sup>, *Ye see and bear that not only at Ephesus, but almost throughout all Asia, this Paul hath persuaded and turned away much People, saying they be no Gods which are made with Hands. So that not only this our Craft is in Danger to be set at nought; but also that the Temple of the great Goddess Diana should be despised, and her Magnificence destroyed, whom all Asia and the World worshippeth.* This Craft therefore of Demetrius was in Danger to be set at nought; the Temple of the great Goddess Diana like to be despised, and her Magnificence destroyed, by the vast Numbers of Converts St. Paul made in the City of Ephesus: And yet those vast Numbers of People amounted to no more than as many as could meet together in one single Congregation. And can any one of common Sense believe this? At St. Paul's first going to Ephesus <sup>l</sup>, he tells the Corinthians, that *he would tarry there until Pentecost; for a great Door and effectual, says he, is opened unto me.* But, it seems, the Consequences of this great and effectual Door being opened unto him turned out, after three Years Preaching, to be no more than so many as could meet together in one single Congregation. Is not this contrary to common Sense? And yet, what is more absurd, if possible, Mr. How would persuade us, that after more than thirty Years Preaching, after St. Paul had left that Place <sup>m</sup>, the Angel of Ephesus had no more Converts to govern than what could meet together in one single Place of Wor-

<sup>k</sup> Acts xix. 26, 27. <sup>l</sup> 1 Cor. xvi. 8, 9. <sup>m</sup> St. Paul left Ephesus in the Year 57, and St. John wrote his Revelations in the Year 96. Whitby says, he left it in the Year 60. See his Chron. and Pearl. Ann. Paul.



Worship. This is a Supposition that must surely appear to every Body incredible, even at first Sight. The Angel of the Church of Pergamus is rebuked for having, in his Church, them that held the Doctrine of Balaam and the Nicolaitans. If there were not Presbyters in the Church of Pergamus, who should there be in that Church that preached such Doctrine? And, if the Angel had no governing Authority over them, how could he prevent any one's maintaining erroneous and heretical Opinions? But, in short, any Person who considers the rapid Progress Christianity made all over the World, and what Multitudes of Believers came into it in a very small Space of Time; which our Lord describes under the Metaphor of the <sup>9</sup> Kingdom of Heaven's suffering Violence: He who considers all this, cannot, as should seem to me, but conclude that, in the Year of our Lord 96, there must have been a much greater Number of Believers in each of those seven mighty Cities, than could possibly meet for divine Worship in one, or even in two or three Congregations. But they were all subject to one Angel in each City, who, of Consequence, must have many Presbyters under his Jurisdiction. And so in other great Cities there undoubtedly were many Presbyters. As in Antioch, where the Gospel was preached immediately upon the Persecution that arose about Stephen, we read in the Acts <sup>9</sup>, that *the Hand of the Lord was with them; and a great Number believed and turned unto the Lord.* And when Barnabas had come from Jerusalem, to assist in that Work <sup>9</sup>, *much People were added to the Lord.* And, when Barnabas brought Paul <sup>9</sup>, *they assembled themselves with the Church a whole Year, and taught much People; and converted Gentiles as well as Jews.* The

<sup>9</sup> Matt. xi. 12.    <sup>9</sup> Acts xi. 21.    <sup>9</sup> Ib. v. 24.    <sup>9</sup> Ib. v. 26.

Multitude of which Gentile Converts was so great, that the Question about Circumcision became of such Importance, as to require a Determination of all the Apostles, and the whole Church of Jerusalem assembled in Council. And all this great Bustle occasioned by one Congregation only, of both Jews and Gentiles! In Jerusalem, at the Time St. Paul went thither from Ephesus, there were many Myriads of Jews which believed: And all those Myriads must, according to our Author, be comprized in one Congregation! Can any Man believe such Impossibilities? It was alledged by Mr. Forster, "That it would be unreasonable  
 " for them to bear the Blame of other Men's  
 " Faults, if they had no Power to correct them."  
 " Very true, Sir, says Mr. How; but would it  
 " not have been as well if you had said a Word  
 " or two to shew how this correcting Power was  
 " lodged only in the Hands of a certain Governor,  
 " who was of a different Order from the ordinary  
 " Pastors? Then, indeed, we should have had,  
 " for once, something like a Syllogism for your  
 " Bishop." As, then, he is so fond of Syllogisms I will give him one; and let the Reader judge, whether it be a just one or no. What single Person soever is set over any Church, such as that at Pergamus, &c. wherein there are many Presbyters, and has the Power of censuring, suspending, and excommunicating, lodged in himself alone, that Person is, to all Intents and Purposes, a Bishop ancient and modern. But the Angels in the Revelations were single Persons, set over their several Churches, as Ephesus, &c. in each of which were many Presbyters, and had the Power of censuring, suspending, and excommunicating, confined to their single Persons only. Therefore they were each of them true and real Bishops of their several Churches,

Churches, such as always were, and always have been since. It has been sufficiently proved, I hope, that the Church of Ephesus must have had diverse Presbyters in it at that Time. And it plainly appears, that the Angel of the Church of Pergamus had Authority over many Presbyters, as he is blamed for suffering the Doctrine of Balaam to be preached in his Church. But if every Teacher there had been independent, and he had no governing Authority over other Presbyters, how could he prevent any one's maintaining erroneous or heretical Opinions? And thus I have proved the minor Proposition of my Syllogism, which was all that was wanted to be proved against Mr. How. And now he may tell us again, if he pleases, "that it ever was, and ever will be, the Duty of every Minister, and every Christian, to see that no false Teachers creep in unawares." But how? Not by casting them out of the Church himself, which he has no Power to do; but by informing the Person who has the Power of Excommunication lodged in him. Even as in the State, every private Christian, whether of the Clergy or Laity, is bound to see that no Stirrer up of Sedition creep in unawares; but not by taking and hanging him up himself, but by applying to the proper Magistrate who has the Power of Punishing lodged in him. But our Author, still farther to prove his Point, has produced a notable Instance, which, though mangled as the Quotation is, will do him but little Good; as I hope to make appear in the Sequel. But let us see what he says. "But what, says he, if I should shew you other Persons, who certainly were no Bishops, reprov- ed for the very same Fault that you suppose these Angels were? You may find an Instance. It is reported commonly that there is Fornication amongst

E 3

1 Epist. Pag. 59. ad Im.

" 1 Cor. v. 1, 2.



" amongst you : and ye are puffed up, and have  
 " not rather mourned, that he that hath done this  
 " Deed might be taken away from you. Now,  
 " Sir, why did the Apostle reprove the whole Co-  
 " rinthian Church for the Fault of the incestuous  
 " Person, if they had no Power to censure him ?  
 " It had been unreasonable. But they had such  
 " a Power, and are therefore ordered to " put a-  
 " way from them that wicked Person : which is  
 " directed to be done as the Act of the whole  
 " Church, when gathered together in the Name  
 " of the Lord Jesus Christ. Nor let it be said  
 " that this was done by the apostolick Authori-  
 " rity : for they are reproved that they had not  
 " done it before, and are now required to do it  
 " in the Name of Christ, whose Law, in this  
 " Case, was dictated by the Apostle as an inspired  
 " Person." In Answer to this I must observe, that  
 it appears from our Author's own Quotation, that  
 St. Paul did not reprove the Corinthians for not  
 having excommunicated this Man before, as Mr.  
 How says : but because they did not *mourn that*  
*be that had done this Deed, might be taken away from*  
*amongst them.* Now to be sorry and mourn be-  
 cause a Man is not punished by those who have  
 Authority, and to have it in one's own Power to  
 punish him, are two very different Things. If  
 therefore these Corinthians had it in their own  
 Power to punish the incestuous Person, why did  
 they not do it ? Why are they found Fault with  
 for not mourning that he might be taken away  
 from them, when they could have done the Thing  
 themselves without St. Paul's Help ? He might  
 have found Fault with them for not having done  
 it, but not for having omitted to mourn that it  
 might be done. So that, according to Mr. How's  
 own Quotation, the Corinthians could only grieve  
 that

that this Man might be excommunicated; but could not excommunicate him by their own Power: And of Consequence<sup>a</sup>, when the Apostle bids them put away from among them that wicked Person, it was by his Authority alone; and they were only the Instruments of executing his Sentence. And this Sentence had passed upon him before ever he had wrote, or they had read this Epistle<sup>b</sup>. ἤδη ἀπέριξα, says he; I have already determined, concerning him that hath done this Deed, to deliver such a one unto Satan<sup>c</sup>. *For I verily, as absent in Body, but present in Spirit, have judged already as though I were present.* It appears therefore from hence that St. Paul was enabled, by the Holy Spirit, to discern Things done at a Distance, <sup>d</sup> as Elisha did the Actions of Gehazi, by his prophetick Spirit; which Sense is confirmed by our Apostle in his Epistle to the Colossians. <sup>e</sup> *For though, says he, I am absent in the Flesh, yet I am with you in the Spirit, joying and beholding your Order, and the Stedfastness of your Faith.* But, in his Absence, he could not behold their Order, and the Stedfastness of their Faith, by his own Spirit, but only by the Assistance of the Holy Spirit. So that τοῦ ἐμοῦ πνεύματος means that spiritual Gift he had of knowing Things that were done at a Distance; and consequently of knowing what was fit to be done. Now, does St. Paul, in this Case, require their Assistance? Does he leave the least Particular of this Transaction for them to determine upon? Does he even ask the Corinthians so much as their Opinion? No. He neither required, nor expected, either their Consent or Assistance in this Case. But, we are told<sup>f</sup>, it is directed to be done as the Act of the whole Church, when gathered together in the Name of our Lord Jesus Christ. But, hold: I must here observe,

E 4

that

<sup>a</sup> 1 Cor. v. 13.<sup>b</sup> Ib. v. 4, 6.<sup>c</sup> Ib. v. 3.<sup>d</sup> 2 Kings

v. 26.

<sup>e</sup> Col. ii. 5.<sup>f</sup> Episc. Pag. 51.

that Mr. How has taken the Liberty of transposing the Scripture a little, and putting those Words before, in his Book, which follow, in the Text. For the Words, *in the Name of our Lord Jesus Christ*, precede the Words, *when ye are gathered together*. And those Words, *when ye are gathered together*, must be joined in Construction with what follows, *and my Spirit, with the Power of our Lord Jesus Christ*. Hence the Reader will observe, that the Corinthians had no Power to excommunicate this wicked Person, even when they were gathered together, and in the Name of our Lord Jesus Christ too, except they had along with them St. Paul's Spirit, with the Power of our Lord Jesus Christ. For the Power of our Lord Jesus Christ accompanied St. Paul's Spirit, but would not be among them separate from the Apostle's Spirit. And this Power of Excommunication St. Paul claims to himself, together with all Power of Government and Discipline among them as their peculiar Apostle, or Bishop; which he declares himself to be †: *If I be not an Apostle unto others, yet doubtless I am to you*, exclusive of all others in the Church of Corinth, or any where else. And so the Apostle continued to be till he had set Erastus over them. The Case therefore of the incestuous Man is this: St. Paul knew what the incestuous Person had been doing, and all the Circumstances of that Transaction, by the Means of his prophetick Spirit; and therefore knew what Punishment he deserved; and accordingly determined by his own Power, what should be done with him, without consulting the Corinthians at all. When he had done that, he writes them this Epistle, and chides them for not mourning and complaining that this wicked Man might be taken away from them. He tells them he had already passed Sentence upon him before he wrote his Epistle: He then orders them

† 1 Cor. v. 4.

‡ Ib. ix. 2.



them to *put away from among them that wicked Person*: That is, to publish the Apostle's Sentence which he had passed against him. And they were to do it whilst they were gathered together, or in full Congregation. Not, as Mr. How says, that <sup>1</sup> it might be done as the Act of the whole Church; but that it might be more generally known and observed; and that, by it's being done in so solemn a Manner, People might be the more terrified, and become more fearful of doing the like. Therefore all that the Corinthians had to do, in this Case, was to declare amidst the Congregation the Apostle's Sentence, and to act accordingly. For he knew the Case, and considered it, and determined what should be done upon it, by himself and his own Power and Authority alone, before ever they were aware that he knew any Thing of the Matter, as he was at that Time at some Distance from them. When he had come to his Determination he writes to them, and gives them Orders what to do in the Case; and they acted agreeably to his Orders; which was all that concerned them in that Affair. And to make all this more evident, if possible, we find St. Paul alluding to this very Case in his second Epistle, where he again takes the Whole of the Power to himself, and leaves nothing but Obedience to the Corinthians. *For to this End also did I did write,* says he, *that I might know the Proof of you, whether you be obedient in all Things.* Exactly parallel to this is the Case of <sup>2</sup> Rogatianus and Numidicus, two of St. Cyprian's Presbyters, when they, deputed by him, pronounced his Sentence of Excommunication against Felicissimus, in his Church of Carthage, or, in St. Paul's Words, *put Felicissimus away from among them.* Whoever will compare these two Cases together, he will find them correspond.

<sup>1</sup> 1 Cor. v. 13.      <sup>2</sup> Episc. Pag. 51.      \* Cyp. Epist. 41. Ed. Ox.    2 Cor. ii. 9.

pond. *Hōn xēpūz*, says St. Paul, when absent, I have judged already: i. e. concerning the incestuous Person. *Abſtentum ſe a nobis ſciat*, ſays St. Cyprian, when in Exile: Let him know I have excommunicated him, that is, Feliciffimus. They both exert the ſame Powers at a Diſtance. The only Difference is this: The Apoſtle knew the Caſe by his prophetick Spirit; but St. Cyprian was informed by Letters. A little farther on, in the ſame Page, Mr. How has a Mind to give us his Notion of episcopal Powers. " " In the ſame " Manner, ſays he, St. Paul directs other Churches " " *to warn the Unruly, \* to withdraw themſelves* " *from every Brother that walked diſorderly; to note* " *ſuch, and have no Company with them, that they* " *might be aſhamed.* Here are plainly episcopal " Powers." Now, for my Part, I cannot find out the leaſt Shadow of any Powers that are peculiarly episcopal in theſe Paſſages, as Mr. How has quoted them. For what Inſtance of Power does a Man exert, when he warns his Neighbour againſt walking unruly? The meaneſt and moſt helpless Perſon in the World may do that, if he has but Senſe enough. And when I withdraw myſelf from every Brother that walketh diſorderly; when I note ſuch Perſons, and have no Company with them, that they may be aſhamed; is this acting with Power? Or does my Behaviour in this Particular ſhew my having any Power, or the leaſt Authority, over ſuch diſorderly Walkers, or any Body elſe? If he had not mangled theſe Paſſages, he might, if he would, have eaſily found episcopal Power. But that Part of them he wiſely left out, becauſe it would not ſerve his Purpoſe; but would have ſhewed that theſe Words were ſo far from indicating any episcopal Powers in theſe

Theſſa-

<sup>1</sup> Cyprian. ubi ſup.    <sup>m</sup> Epifc. P. 51.    <sup>n</sup> 1 Theſſ. v. 14.    <sup>o</sup> Theſſ. iii. 6, 14.

Thessalonians over any Body, that, on the contrary, they manifest that this Behaviour of theirs was in Consequence of a Command from one who had episcopal Powers. For thus says St. Paul, *Now we exhort you, Brethren, warn them that are, &c.* *Now we command you, Brethren, in the Name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye, &c.* And if any Man obey not our Word by this Epistle, note, &c. Here indeed are episcopal Powers, such as Timothy and Titus, and their Successors, always enjoyed. For the Apostle commands them to act so and so, and avoid the Company of him who will not obey the Apostle's Injunctions, and they acted accordingly. But how can that Man be supposed to have any Authority, who has nothing to do but to obey the Orders of another? For these Thessalonians had no Business at all but to obey the Apostle's Injunctions, and regulate, thereby, each his own particular Conduct. Our Author comes now again to the Angels of the seven Churches, and requires a Proof of their not having been Presbyters over single independent Congregations; not liking the Trouble, I suppose, of consulting a Couple of Books, to which he had been referred. But, however, one he has seen, and therefore we will consider what he has observed from it. This is the *original Draught of the primitive Church*, in his Examination of which he observes, "that he  
 " has looked over Mr. Slater's Answer to the In-  
 " quiry, again and again, Page by Page — and  
 " not a Word says he, about these Angels could I  
 " find in him." Now Mr. Slater, after having  
 observed " the many Repetitions, in Sir Peter  
 " King's Book, of the same Arguments, where-  
 " by he labours separately to prove, that the Dio-  
 " ceses of Smyrna, Ephesus, Magnesia, Philadel-  
 " phia,  
 " 1 Thess. v. 14. 2 Thess. iii. 6. 1b. v. 14.  
 " Episc. P. 52. 1b. ub. sup. Orig. Dr. P. 78.



“phia, and Trallium, were such Sort of Churches  
 “as he contended for, says he, The Strength of all  
 “these Arguments, I conceive, I have fairly tried  
 “already.” But three of these Churches, Smyrna, Ephesus, and Philadelphia, were Part of those seven Churches, to the Angels of which St. John wrote in the Revelations. Mr. Slater then imagined he had confuted the Arguments alledged by Sir Peter King, in Proof of those Churches being only congregational Churches. For there was no Dispute between Mr. S. and his Adversary, whether these Angels were single Persons or no; but whether they were set each over one single Congregation, or had each of them more than one Congregation under his particular Jurisdiction. He had no Occasion to mention the Angels, and therefore the judicious Reader will see that Mr. How's not finding the Word Angel is little to the Purpose, as it does not affect the Question. Let us see then what Mr. S. does say in Proof of the Point I am now defending. “Is it, says he, so obvious to common Sense, as not to deserve a little Notice, and plainer Explication of it (than Sir Peter King had given) how the many Thousands, from Time to Time, converted in Jerusalem alone, and the daily Increase of them, (as it is specified in the Texts here noted in the Margin) should commodiously, or indeed possibly;

Orig. Dr. Pag. 37.

Acts i. 15. The Number of the Names together were about an hundred and twenty. Acts ii. 41. There were added to them about three Thousand Souls. V. 47. The Lord added to the Church daily such as should be saved. Act. iv. 4. (Peter and John preaching afterwards, upon healing the Cripple) many of them which heard believed; and the Number of the Men were about five Thousand. Acts v. 14. Believers were the more added to the Lord, Multitudes both of Men and Women. Acts vi. 7. And the Word of God increased, and the Number of the Disciples multiplied in Jerusalem greatly; and a great Company of the Priests were obedient to the Faith.

“sibly, worship God in one and the same Place  
 “together, since they neither had the capacious  
 “Temple, or any other Place that should be too  
 “much taken Notice of, to hold such a nume-  
 “rous, and indeed inconceivable, Assembly in.  
 “And yet St. James, the Bishop of this Church,  
 “himself, in a few Years after, calls those Thou-  
 “sands of converted Jews by the multiplied Num-  
 “ber of Myriads of them: \* *Thou seest, Brother,*  
 “*how many Thousands (it should be Myriads) of*  
 “*Jews there are, which believe.* The inspired Pen-  
 “men, who relate all this, had little Reason to  
 “record in Sacred Writ, or to amuse Posterity  
 “with the Number, Method, or Nature of the  
 “Churches, Oratories, or Meeting-houses, call  
 “them what you please, wherein those Multitudes  
 “of blessed Converts held Assemblies for the Of-  
 “fices and Mysteries of their new Religion.” But  
 yet the Account we have of their Breaking of Bread  
 from House to House is no imperfect Intimation  
 of it: For those Houses where they broke Bread  
 were the Houses in which they assembled together  
 to perform divine Service, and celebrate the Lord’s  
 Supper; for Breaking of Bread is a Scripture  
 Phrase to indicate the Celebrating that holy Rite.  
 But why in several Houses, and not all together in  
 one single Congregation? Why, because there was  
 no House could be got that would hold them all;  
 nay, I should not be amiss if I should say they  
 could not get a House that would hold the fifth,  
 or even the tenth Part of them. Those Houses  
 therefore were no other than so many several Con-  
 gregations, which had their Elders, or Presbyters,  
 to perform divine Service in them; as we find the  
 Case was, when St. Paul found them assembled  
 under St. James, their Bishop, at Jerusalem. And  
 signifi

so

so says Grotius : " They had their several Meet-  
 ing-houses, as it were Synagogues." " But, with-  
 out any other Argument, the Master of Fact, as  
 recorded by St. Luke, commands our Belief, as  
 to the prodigious Numbers of People converted  
 to the Christian Faith at that Time. And, if  
 common Sense and Reason can contract such  
 Numbers into a single Congregation, all their  
 other Writings, I am afraid, will feel the dan-  
 gerous Effect of such Commenting upon them ;"  
 as Mr. Slater justly observes <sup>b</sup>. I shall now make  
 no Scruple to assert, that Mr. S. has given us  
 pretty good Proof, we taking common Sense to  
 our Aid, that both the Angels of those Churches  
 mentioned in the Revelations, and of all other  
 Cities, at the Time St. John wrote, must have had  
 more than one Congregation within their Juris-  
 diction. But all this, and much more that might  
 be said, Mr. How can blow away at a Breath. For  
 it seems " every one may not find the same Difficulty  
 with Mr. S. in conceiving of a single Congregation  
 in these Circumstances." I have nothing to say  
 about his Power of Conception. But I am pretty  
 sure of this, that the Reader will not apprehend  
 such Power of Conception to be a sufficient Answer  
 to what has been just now alledged to the contrary.  
 Our Author conceives farther, that, because the  
 Scripture speaks of the Church of Ephesus and  
 other Cities, as one Church, in the singular Num-  
 ber, there arises from thence a strong natural Pre-  
 sumption on his Side of the Question. Now, be-  
 fore any Manner of Presumption can arise in his  
 Favour from such a Way of speaking, he must first  
 plainly prove, that the sacred Writers, when they  
 speak of a Church in the singular Number, always  
 mean a Church that consists of no more than one  
 single

<sup>a</sup> Grot. in Act. ii. 46. Coetus habebant peculiare, tanquam  
 Synagogas. <sup>b</sup> S. ubi supra. <sup>c</sup> Episc. P. 52. <sup>d</sup> Ib. 53.



single Congregation. But there is not the least Hint of this in all the whole Scripture. Therefore, when we prove the utter Impossibility of all the Christians, in such a City as Ephesus, &c. being gathered together in one single Congregation, I say there is more than a strong natural Presumption on our Side of the Question. It is said, however, “ that a mere Declamation on the Probability of their Numbers will be nothing to the Purpose, till you can determine what Number they had, or lay the Line, and say exactly just so many, and no more, can possibly stand in this Relation.” We must, then, let the Scriptures say what they will of the numerous Conversions wrought by the blessed Apostles in any great Cities, suppose withal the utmost Result of their Labours amounted to no more than just to such a competent Society of Believers as could be inclosed within the Walls of a single Oratory, even in the largest Cities upon Earth. A Thing utterly incredible and impossible. But, it seems, we must be precise, and lay down exactly what Numbers of Converts they had; which is what, I am persuaded, no Man in the World would in the least expect or think of, but Mr. How. However, we will oblige him in this Particular too. “ It is certain that, in Jerusalem, eight Thousand were converted in a very short Space of Time; three Thousand in one Day by St. Peter, and five at another; besides a great Company of the Priests, and other People which became obedient to the Faith. The Question then is, Whether eight Thousand People can be gathered together in one Room, or Oratory; and whether, if they could be, it were possible for all these eight Thousand to hear one Minister, either in Preaching or Praying, so as to under-

understand in the least what he said? " Dr. Maurice, in his Book against Baxter, says, that in " his Time three Thousand People were reckoned " an extraordinary Congregation; and that it " might be possible for a mighty Voice to speak " to a Thousand more." But I will give him in another Thousand; though I do not believe that one Man's Voice can be distinctly heard by such a Number as even that; but we have got here eight Thousand. And, if Mr. How thinks that all these can be gathered together, so as to hear one Person distinctly; I confess I am of another Opinion; and the Reader must judge between us. But what are these eight Thousand to those vast Numbers besides, which we read the Apostles converted every-where? We do not therefore declaim upon Probability on the one Side, or Improbability on the other; but we argue from express Words of Scripture on the one Side, and utter Impossibility on the other: Which is really the Case, notwithstanding Mr. How's marvellous Power of Conception. But he has an excellent Way of getting over Difficulties, by some witty Reflection, or confident Assertion. It had been urged that the Passage, *' Be thou faithful unto Death, and I will give thee a Crown of Life,* was a Proof of those Angels being Officers for Life over those Churches they governed. " This surely, says Dr. Brett, must " be meant of being faithful in his Office, since " he is here apparently spoken to, not as a private " Man, but as an Angel or Bishop of the Church; " and, if his Office was not for Life, then this " Precept had been vain." Of this Observation our Author entertains a contemptible Opinion, and says: " If Dr. Brett can furnish you with no better " Observations than this, if I was in your Place, " what-

† Rev. ii. 10.  
 ‡ Episc. P. 55.

§ Brett on Ch. Gov. Cap. 4. P. 67.  
 5

“ whatever Shifts I was driven to, I would accept  
 “ none of them.” I suppose Mr. How takes it  
 for granted that the Reader is, by this witty Re-  
 flection, fully satisfied that the foregoing Observa-  
 tion is mighty little to the Purpose. But if he  
 either will not, or cannot, find out the Force of  
 this Argument, I will endeavour to shew that  
 there is some Weight in it. As then the Apostles  
 at first, so their Successors, the Bishops of the se-  
 veral Churches, afterwards, were, before all others,  
 generally marked out for Destruction. The Hea-  
 thens counted them the Pillars, upon which the  
 whole Fabrick of Christianity stood. For, as it  
 was the Notion in our Saviour’s Time<sup>1</sup>, that *smite  
 the Shepherd, and the Sheep shall be scattered*: So was  
 it the same when the Bishops were the first thought  
 of for Persecution; as they, who are at all ac-  
 quainted with the History of the Church, know  
 very well. For that eminent Station those Bishops  
 filled in the Church made them and their Actions  
 conspicuous to all Mankind. And that high Cha-  
 racter they bore carried great Influence with it  
 over the Churches they governed, so that nothing  
 they did, could pass unnoticed. But the whole  
 Tenor of their Conduct was observed, and, from  
 that, many were likely to regulate their own: Ei-  
 ther weakly to give into the Times, or stoutly  
 stand the Trial of Persecution. And this made  
 the Heathen Persecutors conclude, that if any of  
 these extraordinary Persons, whom their Clergy  
 and People revered almost as much as they did  
 our Lord himself, if they could bring such a Man  
 as that to renounce Christ, and sacrifice to Idols,  
 they did not doubt but to make short Work with  
 the lowest Sort, both of Clergy and Laity. Hence  
 we may see how properly this Encouragement was  
 given to that Bishop, as Bishop; because so much  
 F depended

<sup>1</sup> Matt. xxvi. 31.



depended upon the Example he set. He was to stand the first Attack of the Enemy ; and if he could not sustain the Onset, but suffered himself to be carried away by either Hopes or Fears, many, probably, would fall away with him. But, supposing him reduced to herd with the ordinary Class of Mankind, or to be of the inferior Clergy ; his Influence would be greatly confined : This Exhortation would affect but few besides himself. And there could not be any Reason given why he should be singled out, as it were, by Name, and this great publick Encouragement given him in particular, whilst he was upon the same Footing with, and no ways distinguished from many Thousand other Martyrs and Confessors besides. I hope the Reader now sees the Force of Dr. Brett's Observation, and that it was never intended the Bishop of Smyrna should leave his Bishoprick, but with his Life. If he ever left his Bishoprick, all Influence and Respect would leave him. And that particular Notice which our blessed Lord himself was pleased to honour him with, would have been to little Purpose ; because his Example would scarce have been noticed above others that suffered all round about him. But, being placed in that high Dignity, his being faithful unto Death might be the Cause of Thousands more continuing stedfast in the Profession of their Faith without wavering, and resolved to sustain with Courage the fiery Trial that was coming upon them. And, in Fact, this good Bishop, whom we know by Name, Polycarp, was faithful unto Death. He was the very Person our Lord spoke to<sup>k</sup>, being settled in the Bishoprick of Smyrna by St. John himself, about the Year 94 or 95, before he wrote his Revelations. He suffered Martyrdom at Smyrna about the Year 166. Irenæus tells us he was acquainted with this good Bishop when

<sup>k</sup> See Cave's Hist. Litt. in Voc. Polycarp.

when himself was young<sup>1</sup>: “For he lived, says  
 “he, a long Time; and, at last, finished his Life  
 “with the glorious Crown of Martyrdom.” And  
 that at the <sup>m</sup> Age of 86 at least. St. Jerom tells  
 us<sup>n</sup>, that “Polycarp was the Disciple of St. John,  
 “and by him made Bishop of Smyrna.” And in  
 that Station he continued faithful unto Death.  
 But these Words Mr. How will have to be ad-  
 dressed<sup>o</sup>, “not to the Angel alone but, to the  
 “whole Church;” because there are some Pas-  
 sages in this Epistle of our Lord’s, wherein we find  
 the Word *you* in the plural Number. And so be-  
 cause St. John says<sup>p</sup>, *the Devil shall cast some of*  
*you into Prison*, therefore that Passage, *Be thou faith-*  
*ful unto Death*, must be addressed not to the Angel  
 alone but, to the whole Church. Now, it must  
 appear plainly to any Body, who reads over this  
 Epistle with Care, that some Passages of it refer  
 immediately to the Angel alone, and some imme-  
 diately to the Churches. But our Author’s Argu-  
 ment is, that because it is said<sup>q</sup>, “*Fear none of*  
*those Things which thou shalt suffer*, and then im-  
 mediately after, “*The Devil shall cast some of you*  
*into Prison*; therefore our Lord is evidently  
 “speaking to a collective Body.” This does not  
 follow; for one Part of this Verse may relate to  
 the Governor, and another to the governed, as has  
 been already observed. But it is not necessary to  
 suppose this; for all this whole Verse may be very  
 properly addressed to the Angel, and not to the  
 Church. For, if I write to the Master of a Col-  
 lege, or to the Governor of any Society, of Mat-  
 ters which concern his Society, I think I do not  
 commit any Solecism in Language, when, being

F 2

desirous

<sup>1</sup> Επὶ πολὺ γὰρ παρεμνήν, καὶ παννύχλιος, ὑποζῶς καὶ σπιφαν-  
 ῶτα μαρτυρήσας, ἐξηλθε τοῦ βίου. Ir. adv. Hær. Lib. 3. Cap. 3.

<sup>m</sup> See Cav. Hist. Litt. ubi supra.

<sup>n</sup> Polycarpus Johannis

Apostoli Discipulus, ab eo Episcopus Smyrnæ ordinatur. Hier.  
 Catal. Script. Eccles.

<sup>o</sup> Episc. P. 55.

<sup>p</sup> Rev. ii. 10.

<sup>q</sup> Episc. p. 55.

desirous to inform him of what shall befall his Society, I say *some of you shall suffer*; and that because he is equally concerned with them, in Accidents that happen to them, as they are under his particular Government and Direction, and, as I may say, belong to him. So that though the inspired Writer uses the plural Number in this Verse, when the Church is concerned, yet his Discourse is directed all the while to the Angel, as the Head and Governor of the Church, and nearly concerned for its Welfare. But what is addressed to the Churches themselves, immediately, the Apostle plainly distinguishes from the rest. For, before he passes from the Angel to the Church, he acquaints us with it, saying <sup>r</sup>; *He that hath an Ear let him hear what the Spirit saith unto the Churches. To him that overcometh, &c.* And these Words are repeated in the eleventh and seventeenth Verses of this Chapter, and so on; distinguishing plainly what the Angels and what the Churches are to observe, as pointing particularly at either of them. Sometimes this Address to the Churches follows the Words which immediately concern them; but yet so as a Man may easily discern to which they are directly applied. And this Method makes the Sense every-where clear and determinate. Without which I cannot see that any Language can have either Strength or Beauty or Taste<sup>s</sup>; such as our Author ascribes to this Passage, *Be thou faithful, &c.* But, before I leave this Word *Ἀγγελος*, I must observe that it is here used by our Lord in Allusion to his own Manner of Speaking by the Prophets. Thus we see him finding Fault with the Angel under the Old Testament; as he does here with the Angels under the New<sup>t</sup>. *Who is deaf, says he, as my Messenger that I have sent?* Or,

<sup>r</sup> Rev. ii. 7, 11, 17.

<sup>s</sup> Episc. P. 57.

<sup>t</sup> Isa. xlii.

19. כְּמַלְאכֵי. Ω; ο αγγελοι μου. Sym.



Or, as my Angel? But this Angel could not be one of the heavenly Choir; but one upon Earth that was sent by Christ to the Jews, and ought not to have been so deaf and blind. For <sup>u</sup>, *who is blind as he that is perfect, and blind as the Lord's Servant?* Under the Old Testament, the High Priest was God's immediate Servant; for <sup>w</sup> every High Priest taken from Men, is ordained for Men in Things pertaining to God, is called of God. It was his Duty to understand the Will of God, and instruct others: But, at that Time, it seems, himself stood in great need of Admonition, which, yet, he was in no Readiness to receive. This Use of that Word is confirmed by the Prophet Malachi <sup>x</sup>. *The Priest's Lips*, says he, *should keep Knowledge; and they should seek the Law at his Mouth; for he is the Messenger of the Lord of Hosts.* There is no Question but what the Prophet speaks there of the Priest, is to be understood of the High Priest; or that it is he who is styled the Messenger, or Angel, as the 70 render it, of the Lord of Hosts, at whose Mouth the People were required to seek the Law. And the High Priests appear to have been called Angels, not only whilst they had the Urim and Thummim, but after the Period assigned by <sup>y</sup> Josephus for their Cessation. For Diodorus Siculus, speaking of the Jews and their High Priest, says <sup>z</sup>, “they esteem him an “Angel to convey to them the Commands of “God.” Such an Analogy or Resemblance there is between the Jewish Angel, or Messenger, or High Priest; and that high Officer called Angel, Apostle, or Bishop in the Church of Christ. Both

F 3

of

<sup>u</sup> Isa. xlii. 19.      <sup>w</sup> Heb. v. 1.      <sup>x</sup> Mal. ii. 7. מַלְאָכִי.  
<sup>y</sup> Jos. Ant. Lib. 3. Cap. 8. 174 Years before the Destruction  
of the second Temple.      <sup>z</sup> Νομιζουσιν, αυτοις αγγελιοι γινεσθαι των  
του Θεου προαγγελων. Diod. Sicul. apud Phot. Cod. 244. Col.  
1153.

of them were Governors in Chief, and had their subordinate Officers: The Presbyters and Deacons were subject to the one, as the Priests and Levites were to the other. And now, after having laid before the Reader, in as clear a Manner as I am able, the true Sense and Meaning of the Word *Ἀγγελος*, and what Sort of Persons those Angels were to whom St. John writes in the Revelations; I come now to consider the Word *Ἀποστολος*. Our Author after about a Page or two of Declamation, in order to prepare his Reader, sets himself to answer his Adversary. And, in the first Place, he agrees<sup>a</sup> “ that there was some Distinction between the Apostles and Seventy from the first<sup>b</sup>; and that “ they were two different Sorts of Men; one of “ which had Powers superior to the other.” But not for Mr. Forster’s Arguments. He had alledged, it seems<sup>c</sup>, a particular Privilege the Apostles had above the Seventy, of *being always with our Lord*. But that signifies nothing, says Mr. How; for the Seventy were<sup>d</sup> *generally with Christ*. And the Apostles were but<sup>e</sup> *generally with Christ*; so here was no Difference. But must not any Man of common Sense understand by these Words<sup>f</sup>, *that they should be with him*, a more strict and constant Attendance upon our Lord than any other of his Disciples were admitted to? The learned Grotius observes upon this Verse<sup>g</sup>, “ that our Saviour “ chose twelve out of all his Followers, who should “ perpetually be with him, and attend him.” The Apostles were never from him, were with him in his most retired Hours, except when he departed alone to pray. They heard all his divine Discourses, were constant Spectators of all his mighty Works.

<sup>a</sup> Episc. P. 58.<sup>b</sup> Ib. P. 61.<sup>c</sup> Animad. P. 94.<sup>d</sup> Episc. P. 59<sup>e</sup> Ib. P. 60.<sup>f</sup> Matt. iii. 14.<sup>g</sup> Ex omni se sectantium numero perpetuos sibi Comites duodecim adsciscit. Grot. in Mark iii. 13.

Works. They alone sat at Table with him when he instituted his last Supper, and they only were present at those fervent Prayers he then poured out; to them alone were those divine Consolations addressed, and those heavenly Promises made, which St. John has delivered down to us. And it was fit they should enjoy such particular Privileges, inasmuch as they alone were chosen to be the certain and indubitable Witnesses of his Doctrine, Miracles, Sufferings, Death, and Resurrection to the whole World. Neither is it to be thought, that such particular Mention should be made, *that they should be with him*, if nothing more was meant thereby than that general Attendance which the 70 and his other Disciples usually gave him. Let the Reader now judge, whether the Apostles Attendance on our Lord was not a little more particular than that of his other Disciples. Mr. How asks, in the next Place, <sup>1</sup> Where Mr. Forster learnt that the Apostles Commission, when our Lord sent them, two by two, was in general to all the Jews throughout Judea, and not only through Galilee? In order to resolve this Question, we must examine their Commission.

<sup>2</sup> St. Matthew says, *These twelve Jesus sent forth and commanded them, saying, Go not into the Way of the Gentiles, and into any City of the Samaritans enter ye not; but go rather to the lost Sheep of the House of Israel. And, into whatsoever City or Town ye shall enter, inquire who in it is worthy; and there abide, till ye go thence.* St. Mark differs scarce any Thing: <sup>1</sup> *And he calleth unto him the Twelve, and began to send them forth by two and two. And he said unto them, In what Place soever ye enter into an House, there abide, till ye depart from that Place.* To this agrees St. Luke: <sup>2</sup> *Then he called his twelve Disciples*

F 4

together

<sup>1</sup> Episc. P. 60,  
7, 10.

<sup>2</sup> Matt. x. 5, 6, 11.  
<sup>3</sup> Luke ix. 1, 3, 4, 6.

<sup>1</sup> Mark vi.



together—and he sent them to preach the Kingdom of God, and to heal the Sick.—And whatsoever House ye enter into, there abide, and thence depart. And they departed, and went through the Towns, preaching the Gospel, and healing every-where. We see here the Extent of the Apostles Commission at that Time: *Go not into the Way of the Gentiles, and into any City of the Samaritans, enter ye not. But go rather to the lost Sheep of the House of Israel.* These lost Sheep could be those only who dwelt in Judea and Galilee: i. e. The Holy Land, as far as it reached on both Sides Jordan, except what was possessed by the Samaritans<sup>a</sup>. For the Apostles were not to go in the Way of the Gentiles, that is, not to go beyond the Holy Land, nor to enter into any City of the Samaritans. Now it should seem from hence, that, as they were not prohibited from entering into any one City of Judea or Galilee, so they might go all over it, if they pleased or could in the Time. For if one Man should give another a Commission, and say, Go not to this Part of the World, nor to that Part; but go only to the Inhabitants of such a District; would not any Body conclude that all the Inhabitants of it were equally included in that Commission? Therefore, as no Part of Judea or Galilee was precluded them, so they were at Liberty to go into any or every Part of it they pleased. Wherever there dwelt any of the lost Sheep of the House of Israel, thither they had Commission to go. And that our Lord intended they should go through all Judea and Galilee appears probable from his sending them by two and two, thereby dividing them into six different Parties: And so making it easy for them to go through the whole Country aforementioned, in a little Time. For I take it for granted, that each

<sup>a</sup> Vetat Christus Legatos suos egredi Fines Palaestinae. Grot. in Mat. x. 5.

each Party took a different Rout: And how should they know when to return, unless they could know when they had fully executed their Commission? But they could not know that, from such negative Terms, except they were to go all through the Land. But<sup>2</sup>, “they could not do it in the “little Time they were gone.” Now I would, in my Turn, ask Mr. How where he learnt that the Apostles were gone upon this Work so very little a Time: For the holy Scripture specifies no Time. Now, we read that<sup>3</sup> Joab traversed the whole Kingdom of Israel, and took an Account of every individual Person in it that drew the Sword, in the Space of nine Months. From whence it is easy to conclude, that every two might visit a whole sixth Part of Judea and Galilee, and preach the Gospel there within three or four Months. And the Scriptures no where, as I know of, contradict our supposing their continuing Abroad such a Time as that. There does not then appear any Reason to believe but that our Lord intended they should pass through all Judea and Galilee. It was alledged farther, that, before our Lord ordained the Apostles<sup>4</sup>, he continued all Night in Prayer to God. Just<sup>5</sup> as he did on many other Occasions, says Mr. How, without any Manner of Proof whatever. Our Lord is often said to go apart to a Mountain to pray. But that he continued all Night in Prayer is no where said, as I know of, but upon this Occasion. The longest Time mentioned of our Lord’s continuing Abroad in the Night is to the fourth Watch of the Night. St. Mark tells us<sup>6</sup>, that, after our Lord had sent his Disciples away, he departed into a Mountain to pray. And, when Even was come, the Ship was in the Midst of the Sea, and about the fourth Watch

<sup>2</sup> Episc. P. 60.  
<sup>3</sup> Episc. P. 60.

<sup>4</sup> 2 Sam. xxiv. 8.  
<sup>5</sup> Mark vi. 46—49.

<sup>6</sup> Luke vi. 12.

Watch of the Night he cometh unto them. But even here it is not said that he continued in Prayer all that Time. St. Matthew says much the same<sup>t</sup>. *When he had sent the Multitudes away, he went up into a Mountain apart to pray; and, when the Evening was come, he was there alone. And, in the fourth Watch of the Night, Jesus went unto them.* Neither is it here said, that our Lord continued all that Time in Prayer. I do not know any other Place, where it is said that our Lord continued in Prayer, even thus long, much less the whole Night: i. e. from Even to Six o' Clock in the Morning. This was then the only Time our Lord continued all Night in Prayer. And it was particularly recorded, not only because he never did so but once, but because he was about to do a Thing that was of the utmost Consequence to all Mankind; i. e. to chuse twelve Persons, who should preach the Gospel all over the World, after his Death. Another Reason for the Pre-eminence of the Apostles is, that the Twelve only received the Commission from our Lord himself, to commemorate the Sacrifice of his Death, and to preach the Gospel to all Nations<sup>u</sup>. "That is, says Mr. How, either " they only were to partake of the Eucharist, or " alone to administer it; and no Body else to " preach for the Propagation of the Gospel neither." Now this curious Observation tends only to prove, that, if such be the Consequence from what Mr. Forster has urged, it must be the same from our Lord's own Words<sup>v</sup>: *When Even was come, he sat down with the Twelve; and he took Bread, and gave it to the Disciples, and said, Take, eat, this is my Body; and he took the Cup, and gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of it.* St. Mark differs nothing. St. Luke says, *Our Lord took the Cup*

<sup>t</sup> Matt. xiv. 23, 25.  
xxvi. 20, 26, 27.

<sup>u</sup> Episc. P. 60.

<sup>v</sup> Matth.



*Cup and said, Divide it among yourselves. And he took Bread, and gave unto them, saying—This do in Remembrance of me*<sup>\*</sup>. St. Paul's Account of this Transaction is intirely the same with the foregoing. And, if we were to judge merely from the Letter only, nothing farther appears from thence but a Commandment to the Apostles to do to one another as he had done to them. But the Apostles understood, and St. Paul along with them, that what they received of our Lord they were to deliver to other People, and they to others, to the End of the World. However, they only had the Honour to receive the Command from our Lord himself. And this puts them upon a much higher Footing than the 70. The next Thing was, that the Twelve only received the Commission to convert the World. And what do the Scriptures say? *Go ye therefore and teach all Nations.*<sup>†</sup> *Go ye into all the World, and preach the Gospel to every Creature.*<sup>‡</sup> *Ye are Witnesses of these Things.* But we will proceed no farther upon this Point; for Mr. How thinks fit to allow that the 70 Disciples were inferior in Order or Dignity to the twelve Apostles<sup>§</sup>. “Very true, Sir, says he! And where are we now? Just where we set out; viz. That the Apostles were superior to the 70. But where is the Conclusion?” Why, if he is so very dull<sup>c</sup>, as he says some Persons are, I will shew him the Conclusion. And it is this: That our Lord, in his Life-time, did, by his own Practice, point out that Form of Government, which has, ever since the Apostles Times, been the constant Usage in all Parts of the Christian World, without Interruption, for fifteen hundred Years together. For, whilst he was upon Earth, and governed his Church

<sup>\*</sup> 1 Cor. xi. 23, 24, 25.  
xvi. 15.

<sup>‡</sup> Luke xxiv. 48.

<sup>†</sup> Matt. xxviii. 19.

<sup>b</sup> Episc. P. 61.

<sup>‡</sup> Mark

<sup>c</sup> lb.

Church in Person, as <sup>d</sup> universal Bishop, he ordained two Bodies of Men, the one of a superior Order and Degree to the other, to serve in the Ministry under him. From whence it appears, that there were, *then*, three Orders of Men subsisting in Christ's Church : Our Lord himself the universal Bishop ; the Apostles the next to him ; and the 70 last of all : That when he arose, and ceased to govern his Church in Person, he put his Apostles in his Place ; who, upon that, ordained likewise two Orders of Ministers under them, called Presbyters and Deacons. This Argument, however, which has had its Weight with many Persons of much greater Learning than either Mr. How or myself, we are told <sup>e</sup>, afflicts him very much ; and truly he deserves to be laughed at. For how can any Man think, that, by saying this, we have taken all the Power of Government of the Church out of our Lord's Hands, and placed it in the Hands of the Apostles first ; and, after them, in those of their Successors, the Bishops ? Did God give away all his Power over the Children of Israel, when he ceased to be their King in Person, and appointed one to be their King in his Stead ? Our Author talks of his Bible ; let him look in his Bible, and there he will find that <sup>f</sup> God did to the Israelites, in Temporals, no other than what our Saviour did to his Church in Spirituals. God ceased to be the King of Israel in Person, and therefore appointed a Deputy over them. But did not he govern them nevertheless as well afterwards as before ? Did he part with the least Item of his Power, when he appointed Saul King over Israel ? Any Body that will read his Bible, may soon see that he governed them for all that, and with

<sup>d</sup> 1 Pet. ii. 25.  
and x.

<sup>e</sup> Episc. P. 62.

<sup>f</sup> 1 Sam. viii, ix,

with a tight Rein too: Did not he <sup>s</sup> hew them by his Prophets, and slay them by the Words of his Mouth? Just so our Saviour orders and directs the Affairs of his Church now, as much as ever he did before: Though, when he left this World, he appointed the Apostles, and they the Bishops, to be his Deputies for the ordinary teaching and governing his Church. And God himself rules and directs the World, although he has committed the ordinary Government of the several Principalities, of which it is composed, to one or more Persons, as he has thought fit. And our Lord still enjoys, and ever will <sup>a</sup>, all Power in Heaven and in Earth: And by Virtue of that, as his Father sent him, so he sent his Apostles. As to the teaching and governing of the Church, Christ gave his Apostles the same Power his Father gave to him. Whilst he was upon Earth, he governed his Church in Person: After his Ascension, he then and still governs it by his Deputies. Of whom the first were his Apostles, invested with the same Power he had, because such a Power was then necessary for the Conversion of the World. They supplied his Place; and, when they departed, they sent others to supply their Places, invested with all necessary Power, as the Age they lived in required; and they others, down to this very Day. So that our Lord is at this Time the universal Bishop of his Church as much as ever; with this Difference only, that before his Ascension he governed in Person, but, after it, by his Deputies. We do not therefore argue, that, because the Apostles were superior to the 70, therefore Diocesan Bishops are of divine Right; but that there have ever been three Orders of Men in Christ's Church, since our Lord chose the Apostles and Seventy; for by that he pointed out to his Apostles what

Sort

<sup>s</sup> Hosea vi. 5.

<sup>a</sup> Matth. xxviii. 18.



Sort of Government he would have in his Church; and they accordingly pursued his Plan, and so it has continued to this Day. It may be here asked, Why our Lord ordained neither more nor less than twelve Apostles first, and sent out seventy afterwards? The most probable Reason seems to be, Because there were but twelve Tribes in Israel, and the Apostles are, in some Sense or other, <sup>a</sup> to sit on twelve Thrones, judging the twelve Tribes of Israel. And it is likely that he chose seventy, in Conformity to the <sup>b</sup> Number of the Elders instituted, under the Old Testament, as Assessors to Moses: <sup>c</sup> Whose Example Christ following, sent out the Number 70, as he did the Twelve Apostles in Imitation of the twelve Heads over the Tribes, says Grotius. And here we may see the close Connection there is between the Old and New Testament. Almost every Institution of our Lord's is taken from something resembling it in the Law of Moses. So that the one is little else but the Continuation of the other, mutatis mutandis, or changing the Shadow for the Substance. But of this more by and by. It is urged, that “<sup>d</sup> the Disparity between them (the Apostles) and the Seventy will not support the Distinction of Order between Bishops and Presbyters; for, according to your own Account of Things, the Apostles were as Presbyters, and the Seventy as Deacons.” But I must insist upon it, that this Disparity does prove our Point; and it must appear so to any Body that considers our Lord was Bishop; and consequently the Apostles could not be, then, upon any higher Footing than Presbyters, and the Seventy than Deacons. For, if the Seventy were inferior to them, and they to our Saviour,

<sup>a</sup> Matth. xix. 28.    <sup>b</sup> Num. xi. 16.    <sup>c</sup> Ad cujus Exemplum hos Christus elegit, quomodo Apostolos ad Exemplum Phylarcharum. Grot. in Luc. x. 1.    <sup>d</sup> Episc. P. 61.

Saviour, their Bishop, then were there three Orders of Men in Christ's Church, including himself, whilst he was upon Earth : And of Course, when, upon his Leaving the World, his Apostles were advanced, from being only Presbyters, to take our Lord's Place, and become Bishops themselves, they ordained Presbyters and Deacons, and transmitted the same Form of Government to the Bishops, their Successors, as it continues, without Alteration, to this Day. Therefore we say, that our Lord shewed, by his own Practice, that he intended the same Form of Government, as now it is, should be carried on to the End of the World ; and therefore we take this as one Argument in Support of the divine Right of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons. But it is farther alledged, that " a mere Imparity, in two such independent Orders of Men, has nothing at all to do with, and can never infer, that Subjection of Order which is included in Government, and which is maintained between Bishops and Priests in the Hierarchy of the Church." The Reader will here, I doubt not, soon perceive, that our Argument is in this Place represented to his View but by Halves : For we do not argue from those two Orders considered by themselves ; but as being two Orders of Men of different Powers, ordained by, and subject to, and dependent upon, Christ who was their Bishop ; as the Presbyters and Deacons were to the Apostles, who were Christ's Successors ; as also to the Bishops afterwards who were the Apostles Successors. For Christ was the first Bishop of his Church ; and this, I conceive, alters the Case a little. But Mr. How is afraid, lest this Notion of our Lord's being the first and universal Bishop should carry us to Rome. If he be  
so

\* Episc. Pag. 63.

† See Orig. in Matt. xxiv.

‡ Episc.

Pag. 63.

so afraid, I dare say none else will : For who will be persuaded, that there ever was a Pope that consisted of twelve Persons, among whom our Lord divided his universal Bishoprick ; and they among the Bishops ? The next Subject our Author takes up is, Whether St. James was Bishop of Jerusalem, or no ? Against which he objects as follows :  
 “ If, says he, the sacred Penman of the Acts,  
 “ writing at the Time, shall be found to say no-  
 “ thing like it, in the Records he gives of this  
 “ Church, there can be no Dependence, in such a  
 “ Matter of Fact, upon the traditionary Reports  
 “ of Authors, two or three hundred Years after-  
 “ wards.” In Answer to which I would observe, that it does not appear St. Luke had any Occasion for taking particular Notice of this Settlement of St. James at Jerusalem, more than St. John had to give us a Particular of the canonical Books of the New Testament. But this we have upon no other Authority than that of the Fathers, who have delivered down to us the Canon of Scripture with all imaginable Care and Caution ; not admitting all at once, but excluding some and doubting about others, until, after a long and strict Examination and Inquiry, they found sufficient Reason to admit what are at this Day in the Canon. And, if they were qualified to settle that, they were qualified likewise to write such History as may be relied upon. Besides, it was quite out of St. Luke's Way, and foreign to his Plan, to give any particular Account of the Government of the Church, farther than as it directly lay in his Way. For his Design plainly was to shew us, how the Apostles were qualified for their Business ; and what a quick Progress the Christian Religion made in those Parts of the World where he was acquainted. And, accordingly, after mentioning some Transactions of  
 St.



St. Peter and John, and Stephen and Philip, the rest is nothing more than the History of St. Paul, and of some other Passages connected with that. It seems to me much more to be wondered at, that St. Luke never mentions Titus; and yet he was as close a Companion of St. Paul, as Timothy himself, almost. But from hence it is plain, that we must not, in all Cases, expect to find an Author making Mention of every Circumstance we think it probable he should take Notice of; and, consequently, this Omission of St. Luke is no Argument, in this Case, against the Truth of the Fact. Mr. How will nevertheless insist upon it, that what we have delivered us, besides what we find in holy Scripture, is made up of nothing but “<sup>1</sup> traditionary Reports of Authors, two or three hundred Years afterwards.” And, to prove this, he says, that there is no Authority to be had for it, except Hegesippus, and an uncertain Clemens preserved by Eusebius. Now, not to enter far into the Controversy about the Weight of <sup>1</sup> Hegesippus’s Testimony, I will venture to say, that Eusebius was not a Man to be imposed upon; and knew what Regard was fit to be paid to every Author, much better than Mr. How or myself. He says, that <sup>k</sup> Hegesippus has given a most exact Account of what happened to him, i. e. St. James. Dr. Cave calls the Fragment of Hegesippus, which Eusebius has preserved, “<sup>1</sup> a large Fragment, which is of more Worth than Gold itself.” And,

G

as

<sup>1</sup> Hegesippus lived about the Middle of the second Century, and therefore not 2 or 300 Years after the Things he speaks of were transacted. And, accordingly, Eusebius says he was *της πρώτης των Αποστόλων Διαδοχής*, i. e. one of the immediate Successors of the Apostles.

<sup>k</sup> *Ακριβεστάτα τα γι' αὐτὸν ὁ Ἡγέσιππος*—*τούτοις λεγὺν ἰστορεῖν τοὺς χρόνους.*

<sup>1</sup> Fragmentum sane amplissimum, & Auro contra non charum. Hist. Litt. in voc. Hegesippus.

as for our uncertain Clemens, I cannot find that Eusebius quoted, in his Ecclesiastical History at least, any Clemens at all, except him of Alexandria. But, to prove the little Worth of Hegesippus's Testimony, Mr. How adds, that " a learned Romanist tells us his " Works were not " worth preserving, and so are lost." Whereas any one that knows ancient History knows, at the same Time, that many valuable Works, both in sacred and profane History, are lost, as well as others of no Value; their being lost, therefore, is no Argument of their being of little Worth. But, how little Regard soever Mr. How thinks fit to pay to Hegesippus, I very well know how much to pay to many learned Romanists, when they have a Mind, as they always have, to make the early History of Christ's Church as uncertain as ever they can: The Reasons are well known. But this learned Romanist endeavours to prove his Point by a curious Criticism. He will have *μετα* to signify always *with*, when followed by a Genitive Case. And therefore, says he, " If the Meaning be, " that he ruled that Church with the Apostles, it " speaks him no more the Bishop of Jerusalem, " than the rest of the Apostles." This will not appear quite so clear neither. For *μετα*, with a Genitive Case, may be rendered *amongst*, or *amidst*; as, ° Joh. vi. 43. *Amongst one another.* ° Luke xxiv. 5. *Among the Dead.* So that he was Bishop of Jerusalem (even) amongst all the Apostles; i. e. whilst they were alive, and at Jerusalem, he was Bishop of that See. And there he continued to be Bishop, when they went away, alone by himself, as St. Paul ° found him. And I never read that St. Paul, or any of the Apostles, degraded him, when they left Jerusalem to preach the Gospel throughout the

° Episc. P. 66. ° Ib. ° *ΜΕΤ' ΑΛΛΗΛΩΝ.* ° *ΜΕΤΑ ΤΟΝ ΠΑΡΟΝΤΑ.*  
 ° Gal. i. 19.

the World. This Piece of Criticism, then, will do but little Service. Mr. How proceeds: "O-  
 "thers, you know, make him Bishop of Rome,  
 "as much as Peter or Paul." I must confess, I do not know any Body that does so. He would, indeed, force Epiphanius into his Service; for somebody else has told him, that Epiphanius should say, that "Hyginus was the 9th Bishop  
 "of Rome after James, Peter, and Paul." Undoubtedly, if Epiphanius does say so, he flatly contradicts the whole Current of Antiquity, and himself into the Bargain, as will be seen presently.  
 "He tells us, the Apostles Peter and Paul were  
 "the first Bishops of Rome: Then Linus; then  
 "Cletus; then Clemens." Here is no Mention of James. A little farther he says: "The Suc-  
 "cession in Rome was in this Order: Peter and  
 "Paul, Linus and Cletus, Clemens, Euarestus,  
 "Alexander, Xystus, Telesphorus, Euarestus,  
 "Hyginus." Here is every Person named, who was Bishop of Rome between Peter and Paul and Hyginus; and no James to be found. Strange! If Epiphanius thought that James was Bishop of Rome, sure he must have reckoned him here amongst the eight between Peter and Paul. Let us now see what the same Father says expressly of James. After having told us how our Lord was King and Priest; and of the Failure of the Royal Line of David, as actual Kings of Judea; and the Line of Aaron, as High-priests; he says, "that  
 "Dignity was transferred to the Successors of our  
 G 2 " Lord,

\* Episc. P. 66. \* Ib. P. 69. \* Ες Ρωμην γνησιασι περιλοι  
 Πιτρος κ' Παυλος, οι Αποστολοι κ' επισκοποι; ειτα Λινος, ειτα Κλητος,  
 ειτα Κλημης. Epiph. adv. Har. 27. Sect. 6. " Ομως η των εν  
 Ρωμη Επισκοπων Διαδοχη ταυτην εχει την Ακολουθιαν. Πιτρος κ' Παυ-  
 λος, Λινος κ' Κλητος, Κλημης, Ευαριστος, Αλεξανδρος, Ξυρος, Τελισφορος,  
 Ευαριστος, Υγιнос. Epiph. Ib. \* Καταστασεις αυτου Ιακωβ του αδελ-  
 φου Κυριου καλουμενου κ' Αποστολου, Επισκοπου ωριστου. Ib. Har. 29.  
 Sect. 3.



“ Lord, who was himself High-priest ; for that,  
 “ James, who was called our Lord’s Brother, and  
 “ Apostle, was immediately constituted the first  
 “ Bishop.” In his Writings against the Mani-  
 chees, he says, whilst speaking of the Age of  
 the Apostles, and of those who succeeded them,  
 “ \* James too is gone, who was the first Bishop of  
 “ Jerusalem, and who was called the Brother of  
 “ our Lord.” And, in another Place, where he  
 enumerates the twelve Apostles, he adds, “ \* With  
 “ James our Lord’s Brother, and first Bishop of  
 “ Jerusalem.—From which Bishop, and the afore-  
 “ mentioned Apostles (i. e. Peter and Paul) the  
 “ Successions of Bishops and Presbyters take their  
 “ Rise in the House of God:” That is, the Suc-  
 cession in the Church of Jerusalem from their Bi-  
 shop, James ; and in the Church of Rome from  
 St. Peter and St. Paul, Apostles and Bishops of  
 that Church. This will lead us into the true Mean-  
 ing of the Expression of Epiphanius, quoted by  
 Mr. How, viz. “ \* That Cerdon lived in the  
 “ Time of Hyginus, who held the ninth Place in  
 “ the Succession from James and Peter and Paul.”  
 For that Father did not here mention James as  
 being Bishop of Rome, but because from him, and  
 the other Apostles, the Succession of the Christian  
 Churches was reckoned. And the Lives of these  
 two Apostles, and James, Epiphanius was better  
 acquainted with, than those of any of the others ;  
 for which Reason he mentioned them in particular.  
 And, indeed, the Transactions of the rest are very  
 little

† Καὶ παρῆλθεν Ἰακώβος ὁ πρῶτος ἐπισκοπιύσας ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμοις, ὁ  
 Ἀδελφὸς ἐκκλησίας τοῦ Κυρίου. Ib. Hær. 66. S. 19. ὁ Ζὺν Ἰα-  
 κώβῳ τῷ Ἀδελφῷ τοῦ Κυρίου καὶ πρῶτῳ ἐπισκοπῶν Ἱερουσαλὴμ—Ἐξ οὗτων  
 ἐπισκόπου, καὶ τῶν προειρημένων Ἀποστόλων κατεστάθησαν διαδοχαὶ ἐπισκο-  
 πῶν καὶ προσβυτέρων ἐν οἴκῳ Θεοῦ. Ib. Hær. 71. See Pearson.  
 \* Ὁ Κερδων ἐν χρόνοις Ὑγίνου γέγονε Ἐπίσκοπος τοῦ ἐναλίου κλήρου ἀγχιὸς  
 ἀπὸ τῆς τῶν περὶ Ἰακώβου καὶ Πέτρου καὶ Παύλου Ἀποστόλων Διαδοχῆς. E-  
 piph. Hær. 41. Sect. 1. P. 300. See Pearson de Success. pri-  
 morum Romæ Episcoporum. Diss. 1. Cap. 6. P. 29.

little known to the Christian World, if we except St. Mark, who was the first Bishop of Alexandria. I would therefore advise Mr. How to consult the Original, before he so confidently quotes an ancient Author at second Hand, and quite mistakes his Meaning. Hitherto we have followed him, upon a Supposition that St. Luke has not mentioned James as Bishop of Jerusalem. But what if, after all, St. Luke has mentioned James in such a Manner as makes it impossible almost, for any Body that understands the Scripture Language, to mistake his Meaning? It is very well known, that the sacred Writers never mention any Person by Name, who was not in some Degree of Eminence; or remarkable for some peculiar Qualities, or Actions among his Contemporaries: *<sup>a</sup> I have called by Name Bezaleel. <sup>b</sup> The Lord hath called by Name Bezaleel. <sup>c</sup> A Child shall be born, Jeshab by Name. <sup>d</sup> These mentioned by their Names were Princes in their Families. <sup>e</sup> Heman and Jeduthun, and the rest that were chosen, who were expressed by Name to give Thanks.* And many other Passages there are in holy Scripture, which plainly prove the Truth of this. James then wanted no other Style or Title, to be distinguished by as a Person of Eminence and Dignity in that Church, but the being expressly named by himself, according to the Way of Speaking generally used by the sacred Writers in such Cases: And James could have no other Pre-eminence, there, but as Apostle and Bishop in that Church. For, as Mr. How will have the Fathers to speak the Language of their Times, so he must allow the Apostles to speak the Language of their Times. And when they mention a Person, whose Character and Dignity was known to all the

G 3

World,

<sup>a</sup> Exod. xxxi. 2.  
xiii. 2

<sup>b</sup> Chap. xxxv. 30.

<sup>c</sup> 1 Kings

<sup>d</sup> 1 Chron. iv. 38.

<sup>e</sup> Chap. xvi. 41.

World, they did not think it necessary to vary from their general Mode of Expression, in order to obviate the Cavils of any future Writers. But, it seems, “ ‘ if the Historian had thus generally distinguished James by some Style or Title, as “ —the Bishop or Apostle of Jerusalem— all “ had been well.” But, nevertheless, I do not believe we should have been ever the nearer for all that. St. Paul calls Epaphroditus the Apostle of the Philippians : And yet Mr. How will not believe he was their Apostle ; as we shall see in due Time. And what makes such a Declaration a little surprising is this : Mr. How affirms that the Word Apostle “ \* is in Fact frequently and “ properly used in the New Testament for a mere “ Goer of Errands.” How truly, we shall see by and by. In the mean Time, the Reader, I hope, is somewhat satisfied that the Style of the holy Scriptures, in such Cases, gives us Reason to think that James was the Chief Person, or Bishop, of the Church of Jerusalem. But now we are come to what is called the principal Thing ; and that is the Synod at Jerusalem. And in this Case it had been urged that “ <sup>b</sup> James spoke with Authority ; and “ that his Sentence was decisive.” To which it is replied (with great Modesty and Meekness) <sup>i</sup> Where did you learn that James spoke with more Authority than Peter ? Why, out of the Scriptures. But, in saying so, it is not meant that the Sentence of James was so decisive, as that it could have prevailed against the Opinion of all the rest, had theirs been different. But it was in such a Manner decisive, as there were no reasonable Grounds to dispute it. He spoke with greater Authority than the rest ; because he spoke last of all : For, in Assemblies of this Kind, the Man, who either for his Learning, or his Age, or the Eminence of the Post

<sup>f</sup> Episc. P. 67.    <sup>e</sup> Ib. P. 96.    <sup>b</sup> Ib. P. 68.    <sup>i</sup> Ib. Ib.



Post he fills, has a more than ordinary Respect paid him, usually gives his Opinion last of all, and, for the most Part, decides the Question. And, besides this, St. James opens his Speech with much greater Solemnity than Peter did. Therefore let us see what the Scripture says<sup>m</sup>: *And the Apostles and Elders came together for to consider of this Matter: And, when there had been much Disputing, Peter rose up and said unto them, &c.* It appears from hence, that Peter was the first Person of Eminence who spoke upon the Question<sup>n</sup>. After he had done, *all the Multitude kept Silence, and gave Audience to Barnabas and Paul<sup>o</sup>. And, after they had held their Peace, James answered, saying, Men and Brethren, hearken unto me.* Now, if James did not expect a more than ordinary Deference should be paid to what he was going to say, what End could it serve for him to preface his Speech with *Men and Brethren, hearken unto me*? All this Parade had been otherwise ridiculous. But he knew that the eminent Dignity he was placed in, as Head of that Church where they were then sitting, would command a more than ordinary Regard to what he was about to say. And this Consideration made it very proper in him to require particularly their Attention whilst he was speaking. And accordingly we find a Decree was made immediately agreeing with the Purport of his Sentence; and a synodical Epistle drawn up to the Brethren of the Church of Antioch, in Conformity to that Decree. Here then is plainly to be seen a Pre-eminence St. James had in that Synod: Such a Pre-eminence as every President of a Synod has had ever since: And there can be no Reason given for that Pre-eminence, but his being the Bishop of that Province where the Synod sat. For I do not imagine that his Learning, or his Age, or any other Quality he could be sup-

G. 4

posed

<sup>m</sup> Acts xv. 6.<sup>n</sup> Ib. v. 12.<sup>o</sup> Ib. v. 13.

posed to have, were such as might intitle him to more Respect and Regard than was due to the rest of the Apostles. But all this Arguing is to little Purpose, because, as Mr. How will have it, by this Way of Reasoning "Gamaliel was President of the Jewish Sanhedrim, and took Place even of the High Priest present, when, in their Consultation about the Apostles, he rose up, &c." This is, in no Light whatever, a Case parallel to that of St. James, as will appear presently. Nevertheless, it fully proves what I asserted; viz. that the Scriptures never mention a Person by Name, except he be eminent upon some Account or other. For he was a wise Man<sup>b</sup>; *a Doctor of the Law had in Reputation among all the People.* And his Speech shewed him to be so. And therefore the sacred Writer mentioned him by Name. But his Case was totally different from that of St. James. For the Apostle spoke last of all, after many others had spoke: But Gamaliel is the only Person whose Speech is recorded upon that Occasion. We know know not whether Gamaliel spoke first or last. But we know St. James spoke in the Place of Dignity. In the Jewish Sanhedrim there was a High Priest, a known President; in the Council of the Apostles there was none, except we allow St. James to have presided. We are informed of nothing concerning Gamaliel, but that he was a wise and eminent Doctor of the Law. But the Conduct of that Council of the Apostles, and the Part St. James had in it, plainly shew us that he presided there; and he could do that upon no other Account than as Bishop of that Province. So that the two Cases tallied in no one Particular. It had been observed, that "James's Name is put before Peter and John." "Upon which, says Mr. How, are you

<sup>a</sup> Episc. P. 68.<sup>b</sup> Acts v. 34.<sup>c</sup> Animad. P. 98.<sup>d</sup> Episc. P. 69.

" you willing to allow the Pope the Validity of  
 " this Argument, when he tells you that Peter  
 " held the Supremacy among the Apostles, be-  
 " cause his Name is not once, but universally, in  
 " the Gospels, put first." What others are I  
 know not ; but, for myself, I am very ready to  
 allow the Pope all the Privileges he can with Rea-  
 son claim from this Priority of St. Peter. But  
 those are none at all. For what is St. Peter  
 to the Bishop of Rome ? He was, probably,  
 martyred there. But we no where read, as I know  
 of, that he founded the Church of Rome. And,  
 if he did found it, what Privilege could Rome  
 claim from that, more than Antioch, or twenty  
 other Sees which St. Peter certainly founded ? All  
 the whole Christian World has ever allowed St.  
 Peter a Precedency, or Priority, or Presidentship  
 in the College of Apostles. And, among others,  
 for this Reason, because he is constantly mention-  
 ed first. But, says Mr. How \*, " If St. Paul had  
 " mentioned those Names together again, it is as  
 " likely as not, that he might have said Peter,  
 " James, and John, or John, Peter, and James." This  
 is one of Mr. How's confident Affertions,  
 which the Reader will often meet with  
 in his Book, without any Proof at all. For there  
 is this good Reason against it, that Peter, where he  
 is mentioned with the others, is constantly put first.  
 The sacred Writers are not so careless in their Ex-  
 pressions as Mr. How would have them. Judah  
 was but the fourth Son of Jacob ; but after the  
 Benediction of Jacob he is preferred to his elder  
 Brothers, to take the first Place amongst them.  
 And accordingly his Tribe is always mentioned  
 first, when Preference, or Honour, is in Question †.  
 And it is the first in offering its Gifts to the Lord.  
 So that the Scriptures will be found religiously to  
 adhere

\* Episc. P. 69.

† Numb. vii. 12.



adhere to the giving the Preference to whom it belongs. And the Probability will turn out to be on our Side of the Question. There are many other good Reasons<sup>z</sup>, which may be seen in Archbishop Potter, for St. Peter's acting as Chief of the College of Apostles; and for being constantly so described by the primitive Writers of the Church; who call him the Head, the President, the Prolocutor, the Chief, the Foreman of the Apostles, with several other Titles of Distinction. And such a Pre-eminence as this the primitive Church were always ready to allow the Bishop of Rome; though not upon Account of his being the supposed Successor of St. Peter, but because he was the Bishop of the capital City of the whole Roman Empire. But how inferior this Superiority is to that Supremacy the Pope claims is easy for the weakest Understanding to discern. <sup>b</sup> It was observed, that there is not the least Hint given us, in all ancient History, that St. James ever went out of Judea." To which our Author replies (besides the Story of James's being Bishop of Rome) <sup>c</sup> that the Epistle of James, written to the twelve Tribes, in general, scattered Abroad, is a Presumption that he had travelled in preaching the Gospel to the Circumcision." I must crave Leave to say, that it is no Presumption at all against the universal Voice of all Antiquity, which tells us he was Bishop of Jerusalem. As to the Scripture, no Man can find in the New Testament that James ever went out of Judea to preach to the <sup>k</sup> Circumcision in foreign Nations. But we read, that James, Cephas, and John agreed with St. Paul, that he and Barnabas should apply to the Heathen, and they to the Circumcision. So that I humbly apprehend there was no Occasion for

<sup>z</sup> Pott. on Ch. Gov. P. 75.    <sup>b</sup> Animad. P. 98.    <sup>c</sup> Episc. P. 70.    <sup>k</sup> Gal. ii. 9.

for St. James to go to the Tribes dispersed abroad, when St. Peter and St. John chose the converting them for their Province, or Diocese, or what you please to call it. And this they subdivided again; for St. Peter went to Antioch and Syria, and afterwards to Rome: And St. John spent most of his Time in Asia. And Jerusalem, and the Churches of the Holy Land, was St. James's Care; as we plainly find by his constant Residence there. But still he reckoned the twelve Tribes to be, in some Measure, Part of his Province; because a great many Jews, from all Parts of the World, were constantly resident at Jerusalem; as we shall see more particularly by and by. But, says Mr. How<sup>1</sup>, "James's Commission, as an Apostle, was inconsistent with his undertaking the Office of a Bishop, in a particular Church, as his fixed and ordinary Charge. A Bishop has a certain District under his Government, called a Diocese; beyond the Limits of which he has no Authority at all; and which requires his stated Care and Residence. But how could he undertake this, who had, as an Apostle, received a Commission from Christ himself to go and teach all Nations?" And can this Man imagine, that the Twelve thought themselves obliged, by Virtue of our Lord's Commission, each in his own proper Person, to visit all Nations? Surely no Man in his Senses can entertain such a Supposition! For a Scheme, like that, must be, in its own Nature, impossible. And, accordingly, they undertook each his several Part of the World, or District, or Diocese, call it what you will, to preach the Gospel in: And they took Care not to interfere, or come in the Way of one another. For St. Paul took a Resolution not to go where any Body else had been before him<sup>m</sup>.

*Yea,*

<sup>1</sup> Episc. P. 71.

<sup>m</sup> Rom. xv. 20.

*Yea, says he, so have I strived to preach the Gospel; not where Christ was named, lest I should build upon another Man's Foundation. Neither would he<sup>a</sup> boast in another Man's Line of Things made ready to his Hand.* And it is to be observed, that St. Paul never attempted to preach the Gospel at Jerusalem, any farther than in the Way of his Defence before the Roman Governors. And why? Because that *Line of Things* belonged to James and his Clergy<sup>o</sup>: But sometimes the Holy Ghost would interfere, and send them where he thought fit. And so, by Means of the twelve Apostles dispersing themselves about the World, the Gospel was preached to all Nations. And can we imagine that the Mother Church, the Church of that City where our Lord suffered, and where the Apostles had their Commission, where Christianity was first preached, and whence the Preachers of it set forth to convert the World: Can we believe that Church was left alone without a Governor or Bishop? No, certainly. But, after the great Synod of Apostles mentioned before, scarce any Apostle ever appeared more there, except St. Paul. I will close this Argument with the Words of our judicious Hooker. Speaking of the Apostles, he says<sup>p</sup>,  
 “ The History of their Actions sheweth plainly  
 “ enough, how such spiritual Chieftly, as we have  
 “ already defined to be properly episcopal, was in  
 “ the holy Apostles of Christ. Bishops therefore  
 “ they were at large. But was it lawful for any  
 “ of them to be a Bishop with Restraint? True it  
 “ is, their Charge was indefinite; yet so that in  
 “ Case they did all, whether severally or jointly,  
 “ discharge the Office of proclaiming every-where  
 “ the Gospel, and of guiding the Church of Christ,  
 “ none of them casting off his Part in the Burthen  
 “ which

<sup>a</sup> 2 Cor. x. 16.  
 Eccl. Pcl. B. 7. Sect. 4.

<sup>o</sup> Acts xiii. 2. xvi. 7.

<sup>p</sup> Hook.  
 5



“ which was laid upon them ; there doth appear  
 “ no Impediment, but that they, having received  
 “ their common Charge indefinitely, might, in  
 “ the Execution thereof, notwithstanding restrain  
 “ themselves ; or, at leastwise, be restrained by  
 “ the after Commandment of the Spirit, without  
 “ Contradiction or Repugnancy unto that Charge,  
 “ more indefinite and general, before given them :  
 “ Especially if it seemed at any Time requisite,  
 “ and for the greater Good of the Church, that  
 “ they should in such Sort tie themselves unto  
 “ some especial Part of the Flock of Jesus Christ,  
 “ guiding the same, in several, as Bishops. For,  
 “ notwithstanding our Saviour’s Commandment  
 “ to them all to go and preach unto all Nations,  
 “ yet some Restraint we see there was made, when,  
 “ by Agreement between Paul and Peter, moved  
 “ with those Effects of their Labours, which the  
 “ Providence of God brought forth, the one be-  
 “ took himself unto the Gentiles, the other unto  
 “ the Jews, for the Exercise of that Office of every-  
 “ where Preaching. A farther Restraint of their  
 “ Apostolical Labours as yet there was also made,  
 “ when they divided themselves into several Parts  
 “ of the World.” And thus I think it must now  
 appear, that each of the Apostles had his own par-  
 ticular District, or Diocese, in a different Part of  
 the World ; either by Agreement with one ano-  
 ther, or by the Appointment of the Holy Ghost.  
 Amongst whom, James had Jerusalem for his  
 Share, And his being constantly resident there  
 shews he had no Business elsewhere. Now, a Con-  
 sequence of this Appointment was, that he presided  
 always in his own Diocese. But this Assertion, it  
 seems <sup>9</sup>, “ is the very Thing that perplexes Mr.  
 “ How ; and, instead of accounting for Difficul-  
 “ ties, makes every Thing quite unintelligible. I  
 “ cannot

“ cannot make it out, for Instance, what peculiar  
 “ Authority James could have in the Synod at  
 “ Jerusalem, merely because it was held in his  
 “ Diocese. Is it the Law of ecclesiastical Synods  
 “ for the Bishop of the Place, where they are held,  
 “ to be President of the Council, be named first,  
 “ take Place of every Body, and have a decisive  
 “ Authority?” As to our Sense of those Words  
*decisive Authority* I have given it before. But nat-  
 tural Reason tells us, that every Bishop should  
 preside at every publick Act in his own Diocese,  
 by virtue of his being Bishop of it; because who  
 can preside but he who alone has any Power in that  
 Diocese? except the Metropolitan be present.  
 And indeed very few Councils were, I believe,  
 ever held without the Presence of the Metropoli-  
 tan. But however, that St. James did preside,  
 appears very plain; and there is no other Reason  
 to be given for it but what has been alledged.  
 St. Paul, when at Jerusalem, did not apply him-  
 self to the Elders of the Church, but to James  
 only; and St. Luke says the Elders of the Church  
 were with him: That is, he had convened his Clergy  
 to his own House. There St. Paul was advised to  
 take upon him the Vow of a Nazarite; to wipe off  
 the Prejudice the Jews had taken up against him, as  
 a Contemner of the Law of Moses, for that himself  
 walked orderly and kept the Law: <sup>1</sup> And to this  
 he submitted. Now I think the Deference St.  
 Paul manifestly paid here to St. James, by visiting  
 him the first Thing he did; and then submitting  
 himself to his Advice, without saying a Word;  
 shews plainly an Acknowledgment of St. James’s  
 Authority in that Place. For the Apostles, mak-  
 ing James the fixed Bishop of Jerusalem, ceded  
 thereby to him the Authority they would other-  
 wise have had in common with him in that Place,  
 And

<sup>1</sup> Acts xxi. 24.

And a great Piece of Honour it was for him to be preferred before all the Apostles, to be fixed in that Place. This was the Opinion of Clemens Alexandrinus; who says that, "although our Lord had preferred Peter and James and John before the rest of the Apostles, yet they did not contend about Honour, but chose James the Just to be Bishop of Jerusalem." That City was the principal Place wherein our Saviour himself exercised his Office, and taught personally, and suffered, whilst upon Earth. It was the Metropolis of the Jews which afforded Converts to the Christian Faith, before Salvation was carried to the idolatrous Gentiles. It was the Mother of all Churches and consisted of vast Numbers of Believers. And these Things put such Marks of Dignity on the Person who presided in it, that the chief Apostles had Reason to think it would not have been a Diminution, but an Honour rather, to any of them, to have been in his Station. And so thought Clemens Alexandrinus, and Eusebius, who knew as much of the Matter as any Body. And hereby we may see that it was esteemed by wiser and holier Men than either Mr. How or myself, that it was not a Degradation but an Exaltation, even for an Apostle (if St. James was one of the Twelve) to be advanced to the See of Jerusalem; which gave him a Primacy over the rest of his Brethren the Apostles. It is of little Moment to urge that the Advice to St. Paul is given in the plural Number. For it is the Advice of St. James with his Clergy. I make no Doubt but James himself gave the Apostle this Advice from his own Mouth; but, with the Humility of a primitive Bishop, speaks

Ἡ Κλήρος δὲ ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ γράφει ὡς παρρησίᾳ. Ἦντο γὰρ οἱ καὶ Ἰακώβος καὶ Ἰωάννης μετὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν τοῦ Σωτῆρος, ὡς καὶ ὑπὸ τοῦ Κυρίου προτεταγμένους, μὴ ἀνδραγαθὸν δοῦναι, ἀλλ' ἑαυτοὺς τοῖς δικαίᾳ Ἐπισκοπῇ Ἱεροσολύμων ἰδεοῦναι. Clem. Alex. apud Euseb. Hist. Eccl. Lib. 2. C. 1.



speaks in the plural Number ; as resulting from Deliberation had with his Presbyters. But St. Paul applied himself to No-body but James. He went to James, and met at his House the Elders of his Church ; but made no Manner of Application to them. This surely denotes James to have been a Person of great Eminence in that Church ; and what could make him so, except he were the Bishop of it ? I cannot leave this Subject without subjoining Calvin's Opinion in this Case. " " As " the Question, says he, is concerning Dignity, it is " wonderful that James should be preferred before " Peter : Perhaps it was because he was Præfect " of the Church at Jerusalem." St. James's Name was not put first by Chance. " But it seems " he presided as Apostle, but not as Bishop ; for, " if James was an Apostle, he could not be that " and Bishop too." But I humbly conceive he might ; because the Episcopal Power is virtually contained in the Apostolical ; for they which were termed Apostles, as being sent of Christ to publish his Gospel throughout the World, and were named likewise Bishops, in that the Care of Government was likewise committed unto them, did no less perform the Offices of their Episcopal Authority by governing, than of their Apostolical by teaching. And Cyprian, speaking of the Deacons, says " they ought to remember that the Lord " chose the Apostles, i. e. Bishops or Præfects ; " and that the Apostles chose the Deacons as As- " sistants to them in the Execution of their episco- " pal Office." The Apostles therefore were not the

" Quum hic Quæstio de Dignitate, mirum est Jacobum Petro præferri ; fortassis id factum fuit, quod Ecclesiæ Hierosolymitanæ erat Præfectus. Calv. in Gal. ii. 9. ° Hook. Eccl. Pol. Lib. 7. Sect. 4. ? Meminisse autem Diaconi debent quoniam Apostolos, id est, Episcopos & Præpositos Dominus elegit. Diaconos autem—Apostoli sibi constituerunt Episcopatus sui—Ministros. Cyp. Ep. 3. Ed. Felt

the less Bishops ; although they were called Apostles, and had, each of them, one thirteenth Part of the World for their Province, including St. Paul. So that the Apostles were Bishops, only with a larger Diocese, together with some Qualifications which they were particularly endowed with, because the Necessities of the Church so required at that Time ; but were no Part, properly, of the Apostolical Office. And this affords us a clear Solution of Mr. How's Difficulties. He urges farther : \* “ But, “ when the Relief was carried to Judea by Barnabas and Saul, they carried it to the Elders. “ But why were they sent to the Elders ? Why “ not to the Apostles ? Why not to James ? “ The Reason is obvious, says he ; because this “ was an Affair that properly belonged to the “ Management of those Elders, to whom the Care “ of the Church, or Churches concerned, was “ committed ?” If he had added *under James their Bishop*, he had said right : These Affairs being put into the Hands of the inferior Clergy ; because James, their Bishop, was sufficiently employed about that which more immediately belonged to his episcopal Office than to serve Tables. It is farther urged \* “ that the Epistle from Jerusalem was subscribed by the Apostles and Elders “ and Brethren ; and that Paul and Barnabas “ should go up to Jerusalem to the Apostles and “ Elders. That the Apostles and Elders came together to consider. The Decrees were ordained of the Apostles and Elders. Not the least “ Notice taken of James, but as included amongst “ the Apostles. And they are said to be let go “ from the Brethren, not to James but to the “ Apostles.” And how could it be otherwise when the Apostles were sitting together in Council : For, in that Case, their Acts were Synodical

H

Acts,

\* Episc. P. 73.

\* Ib. P. 75.

Acts, and their Epistles Synodical Epistles. Therefore what they did and what they wrote could not pass in the Name of one single Person, but in the Name of the whole Synod. And yet this does not deprive James in the least of his Primacy over that Church. In two Synodical Epistles from the African Churches; <sup>1</sup> one to the Brethren in Spain, in the Case of Basilides and Martialis; <sup>2</sup> the other to the Numidian Bishops about rebaptising Hereticks; Cyprian names himself along with others of his Collegues, who sat in Council with him, without any Mark of Distinction at all. And, in the Body of the Epistles, the plural Number is constantly used; they being the Epistles of them all, when gathered together in Council, in the same Manner as the synodical Epistle is indited from the Council at Jerusalem. And yet in the former we know that Cyprian presided, and in the latter we know that James presided. The former by Virtue of his being Metropolitan of that Province; and no Reason can be given why the other should, but by Virtue of his being placed in that See by the Apostles. It was urged that there were other Persons called Apostles, besides the twelve; among whom were Barnabas and Saul, after their Ordination by Evodius Bishop of Antioch. Upon this Mr. How asks the Question, <sup>\*</sup> “ Were the “ Bishop and his Clergy some of the twelve? Or “ can a Bishop and his Clergy ordain Apostles?” There needs no other Answer to this, than to lay before the Reader the very Words of Scripture itself: <sup>†</sup> *Now there were in the Church that was at Antioch certain Prophets and Teachers, as Barnabas, and Simeon that was called Niger, and Lucius of Cyrene, and Manaen, which had been brought up with Herod the Tetrarch, and Saul. As they ministered to the Lord,*  
and

<sup>†</sup> Cypr. Epist. 67.

<sup>‡</sup> Acts xiii. 1, 2, 3.

<sup>¶</sup> Cypr. Epist. 70.

<sup>\*</sup> Episc. P. 77.



*and fasted, the Holy Ghost said, Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the Work whereunto I have called them. And when they had fasted and prayed, and laid their Hands on them, they sent them away.* In the first Place, it follows very plainly from this Passage, that Barnabas and Saul were no higher than Prophets or Teachers in the Church before they were ordained at Antioch for that Service whereunto the Holy Ghost had called them. For what is laying on of Hands but Ordination? And what is Ordination but the Separation of a Man from the rest of the World, to serve in Things pertaining to God? But who did the Holy Ghost speak to when he said *separate, &c.* And who *fasted and prayed, and laid their Hands on them*? What! did these Prophets or Teachers lay Hands upon one another? Did these few take upon them to ordain without Regard had to the Church wherein they resided? Or did God give his Direction to these few, and overlook the whole Church of Antioch, with their Bishop, under whose Government they lived? The Holy Ghost does not direct his Precept to them in Particular: But says only, *Separate me Barnabas and Saul.* And who should separate them but the Church wherein they lived, and the proper Officer over it who had Power so to do? The Holy Ghost therefore directs his Discourse to the Church of Antioch; and they that laid their Hands on them was the Bishop with his Clergy, as is the Custom at this Day. And they ordained those two whom the Holy Ghost had pitched upon out of those Prophets or Teachers who happened to be there at that Time. I know some think this Imposition of Hands was nothing more than merely as a Benediction: But it appears to me a real and proper Ordination. For Evodius was then the Apostle of Antioch; such an Apostle as Epaphroditus was of Philippi; the Head of that Church:

As the Apostles were Heads of the Churches they planted till they substituted somebody else in their Stead. And consequently this Bishop had the Power of ordaining other Apostles, for what Service soever God had appointed them. And it is plain to Demonstration that <sup>a</sup> St. Paul attempted nothing more than to preach and dispute before this Ordination : And till then was only a Prophet or Teacher ; as Barnabas was, who received Ordination to the Apostleship at the same Time. But it seems *ridiculous to Mr. How* to suppose that St. Peter should fix both Ignatius and Evodius too in the Church of Antioch. As if one Man might not outlive another. And, to prove this, he quotes a Passage out of <sup>b</sup> Dupin, wherein he says that Eusebius is not exact in his List of the Bishops of Antioch. I must observe here that he does not say whether Dupin took his Observation of Eusebius, out of his History or out of his Chronicon. It is well known that Eusebius's Chronicon, as come down to us, is very imperfect, and only in Latin, except some few Greek Fragments : <sup>c</sup> So that the Edition of it published by Scaliger is said to be his, more than Eusebius's Chronicon. Be that as it will, it is certain that Evodius was the immediate Successor of the Apostle in the See of Antioch. He was placed there according to <sup>d</sup> Syncellus in the Year 40, and held that See 29 Years. According to Nicephorus C. P. in his Chronography 23 Years. And I take Nicephorus to be nearest the Truth ; because Theodoret expressly says that <sup>e</sup> Ignatius was made Bishop of Antioch by St. Peter : And he knew very well what he said. If then to 40 we add 23 Years, the Sum will be 63. St. Peter was not

<sup>a</sup> Acts ix. 20, 22, 28, 29. xi. 30. xii. 25. <sup>b</sup> Episc. P. 77.  
<sup>c</sup> Cave Hist. Litt. ad Voc. Euseb. <sup>d</sup> lb. Hist. Litt. ad Voc. Evodius.  
<sup>e</sup> Δια της του μεγαλου Πιτρου Δεξιης Theod. Dialog. 1. Pag. 33.

not martyred till 64, and he went to Rome in the Year 63. He might therefore have Time to settle Ignatius in the See of Antioch before he went to Rome. The Reader will observe I make no Use here of Eusebius at all. But, nevertheless, <sup>f</sup> “ the  
 “ Truth is (says Mr. How) there is no Evidence  
 “ St. Peter made either of them Bishops. Some  
 “ say one and some the other ; and both with  
 “ equal Uncertainty.” And, to prove all this, he quotes Dupin’s Opinion of Eusebius’s Chronicon ; and thinks his Work is done. I take it for granted he did not know of many others that have wrote upon this Subject, except what he got out of a Note of the English Translator of Dupin upon the Article of Ignatius, who says <sup>g</sup> “ St. Chrysostom,  
 “ Theodoret, and the Author of the Chronicle of  
 “ Alexandria affirm that he was ordained by St.  
 “ Peter ; but Eusebius, St. Jerom, and the other  
 “ ecclesiastical Writers place Evodius between St.  
 “ Peter and Ignatius.” And all of them in the right too ; for none of them say St. Peter did not ordain Ignatius ; but that some made Ignatius and some Evodius the immediate Successor of St. Peter. And all this makes the Account Theodoret gives us the more probable, especially as he himself was born at Antioch, and in such emphatical Words tells us that Ignatius was made Bishop of Antioch *Δια της του μεγάλου Πέτρου Δεξίας*. By the Hand of the great Peter. This he would not have said if he had been in the least Doubt about it. All this, however, is but mere fanciful Conjecture ; because <sup>h</sup> “ St. Luke, a Native of Antioch, who lived at the  
 “ Time, and wrote the History of the Planting  
 “ and first Transactions of that Church, knew no-  
 “ thing of him.” But St. Luke’s not mentioning St. Peter’s thus settling a Bishop at Antioch is no

H 3

Reason

<sup>f</sup> Episc. Page 77.    <sup>g</sup> See Not. <sup>h</sup> upon Dupin Vol. I. Page 35.  
 Ed. Folio,    <sup>i</sup> Episc. P. 78,



Reason for his not knowing it; for, as I before observed, he makes no Mention of Titus, who was almost a constant Attendant upon St. Paul. He went away from Antioch with St. Paul; so that, as to his History of the Planting and Transactions of the Church of Antioch, he says as much of Phenice and Cyprus as of that: For every Thing relating to that Church, mentioned in the 19th and 20th Verses of the 1st Chapter of the Acts, is no more than what has some Connection with St. Paul and his Preaching. St. Luke does not write a general History of the Church, but only of St. Paul and his Travels. And whatever else the Evangelist delivers concerning any other Churches, after he became acquainted with St. Paul at Antioch, is occasioned by the Relation such Matters had to the History of that Apostle. So that Nobody but Mr. How could expect a particular Account of the Church of Antioch, or any other Church, in Matters wherein St. Paul had no Concern. But it seems  
 “ the Pretence of the Bishop of Antioch’s or-  
 “ daining Paul and Barnabas is not only a Chi-  
 “ mera; ’tis a direct Affront to the Matter of  
 “ Fact related by St. Luke himself.” And then, after reciting the Passage in the Acts, he says *there is no Bishop here concerned.* I say this is more than he knows. For the only Proof he has is the Word *they*, which he makes to relate to those other Prophets and Teachers. But what? Had that flourishing Church at Antioch no Concern at all with what was done at her own Door? Or were these five Persons the whole Church of Antioch? Or had they any Share in the Government of it? The Scripture says *they were in the Church that was at Antioch.* And as *they ministered unto the Lord, &c.* Did not the proper Officers in the Church of Antioch *minister and fast* as well as the Prophets and Teachers?  
 And,

And, while they were doing this, *the Holy Ghost said, Separate me, &c.* Who did the Holy Ghost say this to? To the other three Prophets, and not to the Church of Antioch? Surely if the sacred Writer had meant so, he would have mentioned them; or said something whereby we might have understood that he would have these three, and not the proper Officer in the Church, separate the other two. They resided in the Church of Antioch, and the Lord said, *Separate me, &c.* Who would think these Words were directed to these few Persons, and not to the Church of Antioch, wherein they lived? And why should the Holy Ghost be supposed by these Words to commission those three to make the Separation, and exclude the Bishop of the Church wherein they lived, and was near at Hand, from doing that which he had a natural Right to do, and had his Commission from an Apostle? Surely we are not to imagine the Holy Ghost would exclude him from doing what he had a Commission to do from the same Holy Ghost, without express Words, so declaring. It was then the Church at Antioch to whom the Holy Ghost said, *Separate me, &c.* And it follows of Consequence that the Church is here meant by the Word *they*. Our Author very positively asserts that “there is not the least Foundation to imagine “that Barnabas and Saul were now invested with “the Apostleship.” It is certain that St. Paul was invested with the Apostleship at this Time, or not at all. For, before he was separated for this Work, he was no more than a Prophet or Teacher; as the Scripture expressly calls him. And, if he had been an Apostle before, the Scripture would not have called him a Prophet; for that would have been degrading him; and the sacred Writers never call those who were invested with that high Dignity by any of the inferior Titles of Prophet or Teacher,

H 4

&amp;c. And

&c. And moreover, if he had been an Apostle before this Ordination by the Church of Antioch, he would have had no Occasion for any farther Imposition of Hands to be laid upon him. For, when he was called by the Holy Ghost to go and convert Macedonia, he wanted not a fresh Ceremony of Separation by Imposition of Hands; but was ordered to go directly by a Vision. Which, as appears from what passed before at Antioch, the Holy Ghost would scarce have done, if St. Paul had not been already ordained an Apostle of Christ at Antioch. But our Author calls this <sup>1</sup> “ a Supposition utterly inconsistent with the Nature of the Office; and contrary to what St. Paul so repeatedly declares, and largely proves concerning himself in his Epistle to the Galatians. Paul an Apostle, not of Men, neither by Man (that is, says Mr. How) not by the Intervention or Ordination of any Man whatever.—He consulted not with Flesh and Blood, but immediately entered upon his Office.—Did not so much as go to Jerusalem, to those who were Apostles before him.—And, when he did go, he neither received Instruction or Authority from them.” And then comes the Application. “ Here Sir, says he, you see the Apostle himself denies his being ordained to his Office by Man at all.” Now for certain, here, Mr. How has forgot himself, or else he could never have represented Things so directly contrary to plain Matter of Fact, as he has done this Event. For the Apostle’s Meaning could not possibly be as here represented; since, if the Case was so, he must have gone without any Commission at all. Because undoubtedly he had none immediately from Christ himself. And, to make this clear, let us consider the History of St. Paul’s Conversion, and what followed thereupon; where-



whereby we shall find who were concerned in St. Paul's first Mission. Our Apostle then, after he had heard the Voice from Heaven saying, <sup>m</sup> "Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me? said, Who art thou, Lord? And the Lord said, I am Jesus whom thou persecutest.—And he, trembling and astonished, said, Lord, what wilt thou have me to do? And the Lord said unto him, Arise, and go into the City, and it shall be told thee what thou shalt do." Or, as more largely in another Place: <sup>n</sup> "Arise, and go into Damascus, and there it shall be told thee of all Things which are appointed for thee to do." Now let us stop here, and reflect a little upon what our Lord said to St. Paul in this Vision; and what any Person must conclude he was to do in Consequence of it. Our Lord then, in the first Place, tells him who he was; and, in the next, bids him go to Damascus, and there wait till somebody should come to him, and tell him what he must do. And what would any Man of common Sense have done in this Case? Why, exactly as St. Paul did. He would obey the heavenly Vision, and go to Damascus, and stay there in Quiet, till the Person came that was to give him farther Instruction. Now here was no Commission at all to preach the Gospel, or do any Thing else, but to sit still and wait for farther Orders. And this he did for three Days together, without eating or drinking; until by the Intervention, and Ordination of Ananias, to the Office of Prophet or Teacher, he went about preaching the Gospel. For thus says the Scripture: <sup>o</sup> "And Saul arose from the Earth; and, when his Eyes were opened, he saw no Man; but they led him by the Hand, and brought him to Damascus. And he was three Days without

<sup>m</sup> Acts ix. 4, 5, 6.  
9, 10, 17, 18.

<sup>n</sup> Ib. xxii. 10.

<sup>o</sup> Ib. ix. 8,

“ without Sight; and neither did eat nor drink.  
 “ And there was a certain Disciple at Damascus  
 “ named Ananias, who (after a little Expostula-  
 “ tion with our Lord) went his Way, and enter-  
 “ ed into the House, and, putting his Hands on  
 “ on him, said, Brother Saul, the Lord, even  
 “ Jesus, that appeared unto thee in the Way as  
 “ thou camest, hath sent me, that thou mightest  
 “ receive thy Sight, and be filled with the Holy  
 “ Ghost. And immediately there fell from his  
 “ Eyes as it had been Scales: And he received  
 “ Sight forthwith, and arose and was baptised.”  
 Or as it is in the xxiid Chapter: “ And one Ana-  
 “ nias, a devout Man according to the Law, ha-  
 “ ving a good Report of all the Jews that dwelt  
 “ there, came unto me and stood, and said unto  
 “ me, Brother Saul, receive thy Sight. And the  
 “ same Hour I looked up upon him. And he  
 “ said, The God of our Fathers hath chosen thee  
 “ that thou shouldst know his Will, and see that  
 “ Just One, and shouldst hear the Voice of his  
 “ Mouth. For thou shalt be his Witness unto  
 “ all Men of what thou hast seen and heard.—  
 “ Arise, and be baptised.” And what is all this  
 but an Ordination performed in the most solemn  
 Manner, through the Intervention and by the  
 Hands of a Man? Of that Man whom our Lord  
 particularly commissioned for that very Purpose.  
 And the laying on of Hands, a Form always used  
 in Ordinations, demonstrates the same. But, says  
 Mr. How<sup>1</sup>, “ the Imposition of Hands was a  
 “ common Rite indifferently used on various Oc-  
 “ casions.” True! But then we are told what it  
 is for; as in Genesis<sup>2</sup>, where Jacob laid his Hands  
 on Joseph’s Head, where it was a Token of his  
 Blessing. And St. Matthew says our Lord laid  
 his

<sup>1</sup> Acts xxii. 12, 13, 14, 15, 16.  
 xlviii. 15, 16, 17. Matt. xix. 13.

<sup>2</sup> Episc. P. 80. <sup>3</sup> Gen.

his Hands upon the Children and prayed for them; or, as <sup>b</sup> St. Mark has it, *and blessed them*. In these Instances, Imposition of Hands was for the Purpose of Blessing; but where a Man is recommended to God by Prayer and Imposition of Hands, to do the Work whereto God had called him; that is, to do the Work of a Prophet or Teacher: In that Case, I conceive that Rite is for Ordination. For, whether you call it recommending, or separating to God, or what you please, it amounts to the same Thing. St. Paul and Barnabas were, by Prayer and Imposition of Hands, invested with a Character they had not before. The Scripture expressly tells us they were but Prophets or Teachers. Whereas now they were become Apostles of Christ; and had Power given them not only to teach or make Disciples of Heathens, but to found and settle Churches wherever they thought fit. But as to St. Paul's Case in particular: One might have thought, perhaps, that such a Call, as this was from God, must have been sufficient of itself; must have superseded all usual Forms in such Cases: But, so far from that, we find that God would not dispense with any of the necessary Forms; not even that of Baptism. *Arise and be baptised*, said Ananias. So that in whatever miraculous Manner our Lord was pleased to chuse and call this Apostle, yet he was to go through all the necessary Forms, and be ordained to his Office, and baptised by, and take Instructions from a Man, that all Things might be <sup>c</sup> done decently and in Order. And by this Ordination under the Hands of Ananias he became only a Teacher, or Preacher of the Gospel; but not an Apostle, until he was consecrated to that Office at Antioch. So that what St. Paul says of his being an Apostle, not <sup>d</sup> of Men, neither by Man, must mean that he was neither

<sup>a</sup> Mark x. 13.

<sup>b</sup> 1 Cor. xiv. 40.

<sup>c</sup> Gal. i. 1.



neither made Choice of, nor, in Consequence of that, called to his Office by Man, but by Jesus Christ alone. Whereas his Commission for the actual Exercise of that Office Christ would have pass through the Hands of Man. Upon this Ordination, St. Paul says <sup>c</sup>, *I conferred not with Flesh and Blood*: i. e. staid not to consult with any Person about what I was to do. And what Need was there for the Apostle to apply to any other for Advice, when he had been already ordained, and sufficiently instructed by a Person who was particularly appointed for that Purpose by our Lord himself? And this will be Answer sufficient to what <sup>d</sup> Mr. How says of St. Paul for a Page or two. But now we are come to a most mighty Mistake of Mr. Forster's <sup>e</sup>; " which " is the Notion of the Apostles ordaining others " to the same Office and Dignity they had; making them upon a Par with themselves, and truly " of the apostolic Order." And, to make this appear, Mr. How reckons up some Qualifications particular to the Apostles; supposing that the being endued with those Qualifications actually made them superior to all their Successors. Let us then consider wherein the Apostles were superior to all others. And, in the first Place, they were superior to all others in being chosen to that Office by our Saviour himself, whilst he was universal Bishop of his Church in Person upon Earth. 2dly, They had the infallible Spirit of God constantly abiding in them, which secured them from Mistakes in either preaching the Gospel, or delivering it in Writing. 3dly, They were endued with the Power of all Sorts of Miracles above what other Christians were. These are all the Qualifications that I know of, which can be supposed to give them a superior Character: For, as to being but twelve, they were enough to begin the Conversion of the World,

<sup>c</sup> Gal. i. 16.

<sup>d</sup> Episc. P. 81, 82.

<sup>e</sup> Ib. P. 80.

World, by going one to one Part, and another to another. Afterwards our Lord gave St. Paul an Apostle's Commission: And these created many other Apostles in divers Places, as the Number of Christians increased, and the Necessities of the Church required. And, as to their having each one-twelfth Part of the World for his Diocese, I do apprehend that, if there had been a hundred more endued with the same miraculous Powers they had, their Dignity in that Point would have been the same. But these miraculous Powers were given them, not for the Sake of setting their Characters in a higher Point of Light; but because the Necessities of the Church at that Time required it. They had their Commission from our Lord himself, because it was necessary that the first Preachers of the Gospel should be Eye-witnesses to the Life and Actions of the Saviour whom they preached. I do not hereby intend to detract from the personal Virtues of those excellent Men, or to lessen the high Honour that was done to them in being called by our Lord, to be the Preachers of his Gospel, But yet I believe that there were many other Apostles and Martyrs of the primitive Church, who were as worthy, and would have enjoyed the same Privileges with the twelve, if the Necessities of the Church, in their Time, had been such as made those Privileges requisite to its Welfare. They had them not because they wanted them not. And, should I rank amongst them the Names of Cranmer, Ridley, Latimer, and some more such, I am persuaded the Apostles would not think any Affront put upon them by saying, that, if they had lived in the Times of the Apostles, they would have <sup>f</sup> been of *Note among the Apostles*. These suffered the Loss of all they had, and sealed their Testimony with their Blood.

And

<sup>f</sup> ΟΙΤΙΝΕΣ ΗΣΙΝ ΕΠΙΣΤΗΜΟΙ Ή ΤΟΙΣ ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΟΙΣ. Rom. xvi. 7.

And what could the Apostles do more<sup>a</sup>? *Behold, we have forsaken all and followed thee: What shall we have therefore?* This was the Argument St. Peter used, as the Grounds of their Expectation of Reward at their Master's Hands. And our Lord allowed of this Plea. But even they had their Failings; St. Peter denied our Lord as well as Cranmer. And to the incredulous Thomas our Saviour said, Thomas, because thou hast seen me thou hast believed. Blessed are they which have not seen, and yet have believed. The Meaning of which Words, in the Hebrew Idiom, is *more*, or, at least, *rather Blessed are they*. And yet, for all that, I doubt not but Thomas was endued with all the miraculous Powers, and the Spirit of Infallibility in every Thing he said, or did, or wrote, if he did write any Thing, in the same Degree with the other Apostles: Because the same Endowments were equally necessary, whatever Part of the Gentile World any one of them agreed, or was ordered by the Holy Ghost, to go and convert. This shews that the Gift of Miracles, &c. was not given the Apostles for their own personal Excellency, but for the more easy Conversion of the World. And that the Case is so will farther appear from the Words of the Commission our Lord gave the Apostles, as we find it recorded by the Evangelists<sup>b</sup>: "Go ye therefore and teach  
 " all Nations, baptising them in the Name of  
 " the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy  
 " Ghost; teaching them to observe all Things  
 " whatsoever I have commanded you. Or, as  
 " St. Mark,<sup>c</sup> Go ye into all the World, and  
 " preach the Gospel to every Creature. And these  
 " Signs shall follow them that believe; in my  
 " Name shall they cast out Devils; they shall  
 " speak

<sup>a</sup> John xx. 25.  
 15, 17, 18.

<sup>b</sup> Matt. xxviii. 19, 20.

<sup>c</sup> Mark xvi.



“ speak with new Tongues ; they shall take up  
 “ Serpents, &c.” The other two Evangelists  
 differ not. We see therefore from hence, that the  
 Power of working Miracles was given to those  
 who should believe, as well as the Apostles.  
 Their Duty therefore, as Apostles, consisted in  
 preaching the Gospel, baptising of Converts, or-  
 daining Ministers, founding of Churches, govern-  
 ing of them when founded, and appointing others  
 to succeed them, as we find they did, in their own  
 Office after their Decease, and to govern the  
 Churches by such Rules, as the Holy Ghost was  
 pleased to give in Charge to them by their Hands  
 in Writing, as we have at this Day : All the rest  
 being only Additions to that Office, and particular  
 Powers granted along with it, such as the State of  
 the Church at that Time required, to be with-  
 drawn gradually, as there came to be less and less  
 Need of them. But the standing Powers of the  
 Apostolate, such as have been, and will be at all  
 Times necessary for the good Government of the  
 Church, they transmitted to their Successors the  
 Bishops, who have enjoyed them all over the Chri-  
 stian World from their Times to the Reformation.  
 An Apostle therefore, and Bishop, in this Point,  
 differ not. And, if so, it is no Absurdity to say,  
 that a Bishop ordained an Apostle, any more than  
 to say that an Apostle ordained a Bishop ; as they  
 are both the same Thing. But, says Mr. How<sup>k</sup>,  
 “ That they left any Successors with the aposto-  
 “ lick Authority in Government is utterly un-  
 “ true, and in Fact impossible ; their Government  
 “ being absolute, and universal, over all particular  
 “ Churches wherever they came, as founded upon  
 “ their Infallibility, by which they could say, This  
 “ is the Law of Christ.” Now, if I make it ap-  
 pear that their Government was neither absolute,  
 nor

<sup>k</sup> Episc. P. 84.

nor universal over all Churches wherever they came; I think I shall have sufficiently proved that it is not impossible for them to leave Successors with the apostolick Authority in Government. And, first, as to their being absolute: This is a very inaccurate Expression; for I cannot tell how they can be said to be absolute, who are under the perpetual Government of another. It is true, they had no written Law to be their Rule; but they were under the perpetual Direction of the Holy Ghost, which sent them whither himself would; not whither they would; and often controuled them, and crossed them in the Measures they had proposed to take <sup>1</sup>. Philip was ordered to join the Eunuch. <sup>m</sup> St. Peter was ordered to go to the Centurion. <sup>n</sup> St. Paul was forbidden to preach the Word in Asia; not suffered to go into Bithynia, though he assayed to do it; but was ordered to go into Macedonia. And, by the Holy Ghost interfering so much in the Proceedings of St. Paul, I am apt to conclude that the rest of the Apostles shaped their Course, for the most Part, by the especial Direction of the Holy Spirit. So far were they from being absolute! The Holy Spirit we will readily allow to be absolute; but not they who steered their Course according as that Holy Spirit directed. But <sup>o</sup> “their Government was universal over all particular Churches wherever they came.” But St. Paul shews us that this is a Mistake; for he never pretended to any Power or Government at all in the Church of Jerusalem, when he was there; but submitted himself to the Direction of the Bishop of that Place, with his Presbyters. Neither did he ever attempt to preach the Gospel, or make a Profelyte, in Jerusalem. <sup>p</sup> “And they neither found me, says he, in the Temple

<sup>1</sup> Acts viii. 29.

<sup>m</sup> Ib. x. 20.

<sup>n</sup> Ib. vi. 7, 9.

<sup>o</sup> Episc. P. 84.

<sup>p</sup> Acts xxiv. 12.

“ Temple disputing with any Man, neither raising up the People, neither in the Synagogues, nor in the City ;” for he went up to Jerusalem, not to preach the Gospel; but <sup>a</sup> *to worship*, as he himself tells us. And this agreeably to the Rule he had laid down to himself <sup>r</sup> : *Not to boast in another Man's Line of Things made ready to his Hand.* So that where there was a Church already established by others, with a Bishop and his Clergy in a regular Way ; there our Apostle did not pretend to any Authority at all ; no more than one Bishop can have in another Bishop's Diocese. And from this Behaviour of St. Paul I gather that the rest of the Apostles observed the same Rule in their Proceedings ; and did settle, in the several Churches they planted, Bishops as their proper Successors, endued with all the Power of Government, each over his particular Diocese, as was necessary for the Times they lived in. And they were not to interfere, one with another, in the Government of their Churches ; as the Apostles themselves did not interfere in those Places where they found a Church ready settled to their Hands. And as to the Apostles being able to say *this is the Law of Christ* ; they were able to say so by Inspiration of the Holy Ghost : And we too can take their Writings into our Hands, and say, *this is the Law of Christ*, because those Writings were dictated by the same Holy Spirit. But I must not leave this Subject without some Animadversion upon a confident Assertion of Mr. How's, where, speaking of James, the Bishop of Jerusalem, he says<sup>s</sup>, “ As for any other James, Brother of our Lord, ordained by the Twelve, to be an Apostle and Bishop of Jerusalem, he is no where to be found but in—Imagination.” Now, as to the Point in Dispute, it is no great Matter whether St. James were  
I one

<sup>a</sup> Acts xxiv. 11.<sup>r</sup> 2 Cor. x. 16.<sup>s</sup> Episc. P. 80.



one of the Twelve or not, provided we prove him to be fixed in the See of Jerusalem. However, let us see whether it be certain that this James had no other Existence than Imagination, as our Author would have us believe. And, in the first Place, Eusebius says of this James<sup>1</sup>, that “ he “ was one of our Lord’s Disciples; and, besides “ that, one of his Brethren.” Again he says, that, “ “ after our Lord’s Ascension, Peter and James “ and John, although they were more highly fa- “ voured by our Lord than the rest of the Apostles, “ contended not about the Honour, but gave the “ Bishoprick of Jerusalem to James the Just.” Now if this James the Just was no other than that James mentioned with Peter and John, what Oc- casion was there for adding the Epithet of *Just* to him whom they chose Bishop of Jerusalem? This Passage therefore plainly indicates to me, that those three, Peter, James, and John, contended not for that Bishoprick; but that all three agreed to give it to James the Just, the Brother of our Lord. But whereas it is urged, that Eusebius says<sup>2</sup>, *Δύο γεγο- νασιν Ιακωβοι*, if he means by this to make James the Just one of the Twelve, he seems to contradict what he had said before out of Clemens Alexan- drinus. In the Menology of the Greek Church, they celebrate three James’s, James the Son of Alpheus Oct. 9. James the Brother of our Lord Oct. 23. James the Son of Zebedee April 30. Hegesippus says<sup>3</sup>, “ he was called the *Just* for “ Distinction

<sup>1</sup> *Ἐπιτα δ’ ὠφθαί αὐτὸν Ἰακώβῳ φησιν*· εἰς δὲ οὗτος τῶν φερο-  
μένων τοῦ Σωτῆρος μαθητῶν, ἀλλὰ μὴ καὶ Ἀδελφῶν ἢν. Euseb.  
Hist. Eccl. Lib. 1. Cap. 12. P. 35. Ed. Read. <sup>2</sup> *Πέτρον  
γὰρ φησὶ καὶ Ἰακώβον καὶ Ἰωάννη μετὰ τὴν Ἀναλήψιν τοῦ Σωτῆρος, ὡς  
αὐτὸν καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ Σωτῆρος προτετιμημένους, μὴ ἐπιδιχαζέσθαι δόξης ἀλλ’  
Ἰακώβον τὸν Δικαίον Ἐπίσκοπον Ἱερουσαλὺμ τὴν εἰσελθεῖν. Euseb. Hist.  
Eccl. Lib. 2. Cap. 1. P. 44. Ed. Read.* <sup>3</sup> *ib. Pag. 45.*

<sup>2</sup> *Ὁ ὀνομασθεὶς ὑπὸ πάντων δικαίος* — ἐπεὶ πολλοὶ Ἰακώβοι ἐκαλούντο.  
Euseb. Hist. Lib. 2. Cap. 23. P. 78. Ed. Read.

“ Distinction fake, as there were many, at that  
 “ Time, whose Names were James.” And this  
 is <sup>a</sup> Dr. Hammond’s Opinion; with whom agrees  
<sup>b</sup> Grotius upon Gal. i. 19. “ I found no Apostle  
 “ there,—except him who supplied the Place of the  
 “ Apostles, James the Lord’s Brother.” And again,  
 upon Acts xxi. 18. speaking of James and the Elders  
 that were with him, he says: “ <sup>c</sup> Who alone of  
 “ the Apostles was there (at Jerusalem.) He exe-  
 “ cuted the Office that the Bishop afterwards did;  
 “ and therefore convened the Presbyters; if it be  
 “ not he who was our Lord’s Brother, not the A-  
 “ postle but the Bishop.” Upon this I observe  
 two Things: 1st, That, if this St. James was one  
 of the Twelve, he convened his Clergy by Virtue  
 of his episcopal Power. 2dly, That Grotius  
 rather thought he was James our Lord’s Bro-  
 ther, not the Apostle but the Bishop. Our Lord’s  
 Brother therefore, in his Opinion, was not one of  
 the Twelve. But Mr. How certainly ought to  
 have been acquainted with what is said by an emi-  
 nent Writer of the Presbyterian Side of the Ques-  
 tion; who calls himself Walo-Messalinus. Certum  
 est, says he, non fuisse unum ex Duodecim. It is  
 certain he (James) was not one of the Twelve.  
 Wal Mess. P. 20. And what Eusebius says in  
 another Place is observable. Speaking of our St.  
 James’s Throne, or Episcopal Chair, he calls it  
 the Throne of James “ <sup>d</sup> who was the first invest-  
 “ ed with the Bishoprick of Jerusalem by our  
 I 2 “ Lord

<sup>a</sup> Vid. Hammondi Diff. 4<sup>ta</sup> de Actorum & Epistolarum Apo-  
 stolicarum Periochis. <sup>b</sup> Nullum reperi Apostolorum—sed

reperi eum qui eorum Vices obibat, Jacobum Fratrem Domini.  
<sup>c</sup> Qui Apostolorum Hierosolymis erat. Is munere fungebatur  
 quo postea Episcopi, ideoque Presbyteros convocabat: Nisi sorte  
 Jacobus hic fuit Frater Domini, non Apostolus sed Episcopus.  
 Grot. in Act. xxi. 18. <sup>d</sup> Του γαρ Ιακωβου Θρονου του πρωτου της

Ιεροσολυμων εκκλησιας την επισκοπην προς αυτου του Σωτηρος καὶ τῶν  
 Αποστολων υποδιξαμενου. Euseb. Eccles. Hist. Lib. 7. Cap. 19.

“ Lord himself and the Apostles.” Now I cannot think but that, if Eusebius had taken this James to have been one of the Twelve, he would have said των λοιπων Αποστολων, and not simply των Αποστολων. But let us see whether the holy Scripture does not favour our Opinion. We have in \* St. Matthew an Account of our Lord’s Chusing the Twelve Apostles. Afterwards he tells us that *his Mother and his Brethren stood without, desiring to speak with him.* We have the like in St. Mark, *how that he ordained Twelve.* Afterwards, that *there came his Brethren and his Mother, and, standing without, sent unto him.* In <sup>1</sup> St. Luke we have the History of his Chusing the Twelve. <sup>2</sup> And then, in a following Chapter, we are told that his Mother and his Brethren came to him. In all these Places our Lord’s Brethren, and the Twelve, seem to be plainly distinguished, the one from the other. St. John tells us that our Lord, *after that many of his Disciples went back and walked no more with him, said to the Twelve, Will ye also go away?* And in the next Chapter St. John says, that <sup>m</sup> neither did his Brethren believe on him. From hence I argue, that our Lord would scarce have chose one of the Twelve from among his Brethren, whilst they believed not on him. And it seems plain from hence, that his Brethren did not believe in him at the Time when he chose his Apostles; though they did afterwards. St Paul seems plainly to distinguish James from the Twelve, in his Account of our Lord’s Appearing after his Resurrection. “ <sup>n</sup> He was seen of Cephas, then of <sup>“</sup> the Twelve. After that, he was seen of above <sup>“</sup> five hundred Brethren at once—After that, he <sup>“</sup> was

\* Matt. x. 2.

† Chap. xii. 46.

‡ Mark iii. 14.

\* Chap. iii. 31.

1 Luke vi. 12.

\* Chap. viii. 19.

1 John vi. 66.

\* Chap. vii. 5.

\* 1 Cor. xv. 5, 6,

7, 8.



“ was seen of James ; then of all the Apostles.”  
 “ And last of all he was seen of me also.” Here are several Times when, and several Numbers of People to whom, our Lord appeared after he was risen ; of whom the first is Cephas, then the Twelve, then five hundred Brethren at once, then James, plainly distinguishing him from the Twelve ; and it is not likely that our Lord should appear to one of the Twelve apart from the rest ; for they were scarce ever asunder after he was risen, till the Descent of the Holy Ghost, at Pentecost. Then, says St. Paul, he was seen of all the Apostles ; from whence there is Reason to conclude that there were more, even at that Time, who were dignified with the Title of Apostles, besides the Twelve. But that James was not one of the Twelve appears to me to be confirmed from what St. Luke says in the first Chapter of the Acts, upon the Return of the Disciples from Mount Olivet to Jerusalem, after our Lord’s Ascension : “ ° When they were come in, they went up into an upper Room where abode both Peter and John and Andrew, Philip and Thomas, Bartholomew and Matthew, James the Son of Alphaeus, and Simon Zelotes, and Judas the Brother of James. These all continued with one Accord in Prayer and Supplication, with the Women, and Mary the Mother of Jesus, and with his Brethren.” Here are all the Eleven mentioned expressly, distinct from our Lord’s Brethren. It is plain therefore that none of our Lord’s Brethren were of the Twelve ; else I think St. Luke would have said *the rest* of his Brethren. Consequently James, who was one of his Brethren, was not of the Twelve : Though he was now a Believer, whereas he was not so when they

I 3

were

were chose, Of this Opinion was the great Barrow, who says “ it is not certain that St. James “ the Bishop of Jerusalem was an Apostle,” meaning one of the Twelve. And, according to him, the greater Part of the Ancients thought so, “ The greater Consent, says he, of the most ancient Writers, making St. James not to have “ been one of the Twelve, it is thence accountable why St. James was called by some ancient “ Writers the Bishop of Bishops, the Prince of “ Bishops, &c. because he was the first Bishop of “ the first See, the Mother Church.” We have then this very learned Man of our Opinion, in Regard to James the Just, that, though he was an Apostle, yet not one of the Twelve. For he was nevertheless an Apostle; such as those St. Paul means when he says our Lord was seen by all the Apostles. Eusebius tells us that, “ besides the Twelve, there were many, who, after the Similitude of the Twelve, were called Apostles, in Proof of which he subjoins these very Words, *then he was seen of all the Apostles*. I could produce many other Testimonies ancient and modern to the same Purpose, if it were necessary. I will beg farther to lay before the Reader the Reasoning of this great Man upon a Supposition, that St. James was one of the Twelve. In this Case he says “ there “ doth appear a special Reason why one of the “ Apostles should be designed to make a constant “ Residence at Jerusalem; and consequently to “ preside there like a Bishop. For Jerusalem was “ the Metropolis, the Fountain, the Centre of “ the Christian Religion; where it had Birth, “ where

<sup>p</sup> John vii. 5.

88. <sup>r</sup> Ib. P. 89.

<sup>s</sup> Εἰθ ὡς παρὰ τούτους, κατὰ μνήσιν τῶν δωδεκά, πλείων ὅσων υπαρχάντων Ἀποστόλων—προσέβηται λεγὼν ἐπὶ τὰ αὐτῶν τοῖς Ἀποστόλοις πασι.

Euseb. Hist. Eccles. Lib. 1, Cap. 12. P. 36. Ed. Read.

<sup>t</sup> Barrow on the Pope's Supremacy, P.

<sup>t</sup> Barrow's Pope's Suprem. P. 89.

“ where was greatest Matter and Occasion of pro-  
 “ pagating the Gospel; most People, disposed to  
 “ embrace it, resorting thither: Where the Church  
 “ was very numerous, consisting as St. Luke, or  
 “ St. James in him, doth intimate, of diverse  
 “ Myriads of believing Jews: Whence it might  
 “ seem expedient, that a Person of greatest Au-  
 “ thority should be fixed there for the confirming  
 “ and improving that Church, together with the  
 “ Propagation of Religion among the People  
 “ which resorted thither; the which might in-  
 “ duce the Apostles to settle St. James there,  
 “ both for discharging the Office of an Apost-  
 “ fle, and supplying the Room of a Bishop  
 “ there. The Reader will see by this Time, that  
 James, though not one of the twelve, yet Bishop of  
 Jerusalem, may possibly have had a more real Ex-  
 istence than in Imagination only; and also that  
 our Author will affirm roundly of Subjects he  
 seems to know nothing at all of; for, if he knew  
 any Thing of this Matter, he must know that the  
 learned World is much divided about it. He will  
 see also that such a Share of the Apostolick Office,  
 as must always remain in the Church, as Baptising,  
 Preaching, Converting, the Power of ordaining,  
 and of governing the Church, did not die with  
 the Apostles; but that they committed those Pow-  
 ers to the Bishops whom they placed in their sever-  
 al Sees, who were at first called, likewise, Apost-  
 les. I will conclude with the Words of the great  
 Hooker. “ Such, says he, as deny Apostles to  
 “ have any Successors at all in their Office of  
 “ Apostleship, may hold that Opinion without  
 “ Contradiction to this of ours, if they well ex-  
 “ plain themselves in declaring what truly and  
 “ properly Apostleship is. In some Things, every  
 “ Presbyter, in some Things, only Bishops, in

\* Hooker Eccl. Pol. B. 7. Sect. 4.



“ some Things neither the one nor the other are  
 “ the Apostles Successors. The Apostles were  
 “ sent as special chosen Eye-witnesses of Jesus  
 “ Christ; from whom immediately they received  
 “ their whole Embassage, and their Commission to  
 “ be the principal first Founders of an House of  
 “ God consisting as well of Gentiles as of Jews.  
 “ In this, there were not after them any other like  
 “ unto them. And yet the Apostles have now  
 “ their Successors upon Earth, their true Suc-  
 “ cessors, if not in the Largeness, surely in the  
 “ Kind of that Episcopal Function, whereby they  
 “ had Power to sit as spiritual ordinary Judges,  
 “ both over Laity and Clergy where Churches  
 “ Christian were established.” As to Mr. How’s  
 Quotations out of Barrow, I shall, for my Part,  
 leave him and his Reader to make the most of  
 them they can. Only I must beg Leave to produce  
 a Passage out of his Tract upon episcopal Govern-  
 ment. For there we ought to look for a more  
 clear Account of a Man’s Sentiments, where he  
 writes professedly upon the Subject; and not where  
 he is upon a different Argument; for in those  
 Cases Authors are seldom so guarded in their Ex-  
 pressions, but he that has a Mind to cavil may  
 make them say what never once came into their  
 Thoughts. The Passage is this: “ It is a hei-  
 “ nous Sin to abolish any divine Institution (or  
 “ even any Constitution established by the A-  
 “ postles in a Matter of Moment). But, that  
 “ such is Episcopal Government, many learned  
 “ Men have fully demonstrated, and the follow-  
 “ ing Arguments will briefly evince.” But now  
 we

“ Nefas est divinum Institutionem (vel apostolicam in grandis  
 Momenti Re Constitutionem) abolere. Atqui tale fore Regi-  
 men episcopale, cum a pluribus doctissimis Viris luculente fu-  
 seque demonstratum sit, tum hæc jam transcursum perstringenda  
 suadent. Bar. de Reg. Episc. Opusc. P. 22.

we come to consider the *Αποστολοι Εκκλησιων*; where, after some general Observations, upon a Supposition of having proved Timothy and Titus to have been no Bishops of those Places, which we with all Antiquity, and St. Paul himself, say they were; we are told that, <sup>d</sup> “the only Person we have left” is Epaphroditus; but without any single Reason given for it, only his being called *Αποστολος*.<sup>e</sup> Now, if that be one sufficient Reason of a hundred, we may leave out the other ninety-nine. And we will see whether it be a sufficient Reason or no: The best Rule then, to judge of that, appears to me to be the examining carefully in what Sense this Word is constantly used by the Writers of the New Testament. We do not here regard how the Jewish or Gentile Writers have used that Word; but only what the sacred Writers constantly would have us understand by it. I say then that they never use that Word, but when they would have us understand by it a Person who is of the highest Order in the Church; call him Apostle, Messenger, or what you will. Where that Word is put for one of the twelve, the Meaning will scarce be disputed. But, as I observed before, there were others, besides the twelve, of whom St. Paul makes Mention, that were dignified with the Style and Title of Apostles, as James and others: To which it is no Objection that we hear nothing of their Transactions in holy Scripture, because we have only a Part of St. Paul’s Travels delivered down to us by St. Luke. For, as St. Paul had his, so doubtless had the other Apostles their Companions and Fellow-labourers. But St. Paul himself decides this, when he saith *“God hath set some in the Church; first Apostles.”* Which is as much as to say that among the Officers of the Church God has given to Apostles the first or highest Station. In the

<sup>d</sup> Episc. P. 92.<sup>e</sup> 1 Cor. xii. 28.

the next Verse he gives us to understand, that it is not every Body who is thought worthy of that high Dignity. For, says he, *Are all Apostles?* Whereby we are made to know that there were others exalted to this high Station besides the twelve. Else, that Observation, when every Body must have known there were but twelve in all, would have been to little Purpose. And again: *Am I not an Apostle?* says he. And what signified his Boasting, if that Title did not properly and constantly include, in its Signification, the highest Eminence and Dignity in the Christian Church? In his Epistle to the Ephesians he says of our Lord, *And he gave some Apostles, some Prophets, &c.* Here again the Apostles are put in the first Place, as of the highest Order. And by the Word *some*, applied to the Word *Apostles*, he must mean that there were others invested with that high Dignity, besides the twelve. In another Place he styles our Lord himself <sup>1</sup> the Apostle and High-Priest of our Profession. Where, by the Bye, St. Paul gives us to understand, that, as the High-Priest was in the Jewish Church, so is an Apostle in the Church of Christ. And this is a strong Proof of the Analogy there is, in almost every Thing, between the Jewish and Christian Church. And all through the whole New Testament, wherever the Word Apostle is put, there we are to understand a Person of the highest Order and Dignity in the Christian Church to be meant. As a Consequence then of all this, I assert, that, when we consider in what Sense the Word *Αποστολος* is constantly used by the sacred Writers, it must follow, that when St. Paul calls Epaphroditus the Apostle of the Philippians, he speaks of him as having the nearest Pastoral Relation to that Church he could have, as enjoying the highest Dignity there-  
in ;

<sup>1</sup> 1 Cor. xii. 29. <sup>2</sup> Ib. ix. 1. <sup>3</sup> Ephes. iv. 11. <sup>4</sup> Heb. iii. 1.



in ; he being the proper Pastor of his Diocese ; the Presbyters being his Curates, to do the Duty (personally in his Stead, in all the Churches belonging to it. But it seems this \* “ Church of Philippi “ does not appear to be above one Congregation.” I am sure that one single Congregation cannot want many Presbyters and Deacons. And, as to our Author’s Plea of Non - residence, I dare say there are not many who will say that a Bishop was to blame for going so far as from Macedonia to Rome upon the Business of his Church. Neither does it appear from this Epistle that he was absent much longer than he was forced by Sickness. Nor was he so far off but he could correspond with his Presbyters very easily from Rome to Philippi, and e contra. As, if he would take the Pains to read St Cyprian’s Epistles, he would find that a Bishop, though upon pressing Reasons, absent from his Diocese, yet could, by corresponding with his Presbyters, easily know what passed there, and take good Care of it. But I think Mr. How has but a poor Opinion of those he calls Bishops and Deacons of that Time, if, notwithstanding their being upon the Spot, the Diocese must be thought to lie exposed to all Manner of Wolves, if the real Bishop be absent for a Time upon especial Affairs. For that Epaphroditus was their Apostle or Bishop, the very Words of the Epistle make manifest :  
 “ Yet I suppose it necessary, says St. Paul, to send  
 “ to you Epaphroditus, my Brother and Com-  
 “ panion in Labour, and Fellow-soldier, but your  
 “ Messenger, (or, as it should have been rendered,  
 “ Apostle) and he that ministered to my Wants.  
 “ For he longed after you all, and was full of  
 “ Heaviness, because that ye had heard that he  
 “ had been sick.”—I sent him therefore the more  
 “ carefully, that when ye see him again ye may  
 “ rejoice.

\* Episc. P. 92.

† Phil. ii. 25, 26, 28.

“rejoice.” Now here, in the first Place, St. Paul calls Epaphroditus his Brother, which betokens him to be of the same Rank with Timothy and Titus, and others the Brethren and Companions of St. Paul; Men of eminent Rule and Dignity. In the next Place, he had the Care of the whole Church of Philippi committed unto him. *He longed after you all*, says the Apostle: This shews that all the Philippians were under his Care. And all along he speaks of Epaphroditus as a Man whom the whole Church of Philippi depended upon. The Presbyters and Deacons had their particular Congregations to look after; but he had the Whole committed to him. Well might they then rejoice to receive a Man so nearly related, and of such Consequence to them, as their Apostle and Bishop must be; well might they rejoice to receive such a Man, made whole again. And the Apostle had so high an Esteem for him, that, speaking of his Recovery, he says, <sup>a</sup> “But God had Mercy on him, and not on him only, but on me also, lest I should have Sorrow upon Sorrow.” And all this, upon Mr. How’s Supposition, for a Man that had no other Relation to the Church of Philippi, but the being an active Man, and carrying their Charity to St. Paul. He carried their Charity it is true, because the sending their Apostle with it was paying the greater Respect to St. Paul. I suspect sometimes that our Author was not a little inclined to be a Quaker. It had been observed, that “<sup>a</sup> wherever we find St. Paul mentioning any Person by Name, that Person is no less than an Apostle or Bishop, either actually so, or designed to be.” “<sup>b</sup> Such, says he, for Instance, as Priscilla, Phebe, Chloe, Apphia, and other pious Women.” Now this may be taken

<sup>a</sup> Phil. ii. 27.<sup>a</sup> Animad. P. 100.<sup>b</sup> Episc. P. 93.

taken for Wit, as far as I know, and may suit some of his Congregation very well: But, as for those who think serious Argument necessary upon such a serious Subject as we are now upon, he must expect to find nothing but Derision from them, for such flippant Wit as this. Does not St. Paul say, "Let the Woman learn in Silence with all Subjection: But I suffer not a Woman to teach, nor to usurp Authority over the Man; but to be in Silence." Can any Man in the World, but Mr. How, imagine, after this, that a Writer, when discoursing of such Persons who were mentioned by Name, as St. Paul's *Συνεργοι* and *Συζυγοι*, and honoured with these and the like Titles of Dignity, could include Women in a Catalogue of publick Preachers of the Gospel? I am certain no Man of common Sense would suppose any such Thing. When I have been talking of publick Preachers of the Gospel, and then say that wherever St. Paul mentions a Person by Name as his *Συνεργος*, how is it possible I should include the Women whom the Apostle mentions by Name, when it is utterly impossible for a Woman to be, in any Degree, a publick Preacher of the Gospel? <sup>a</sup> St. Paul does indeed take Notice of some Women, who, he says, *συνηθλησαν μοι*, laboured with me in the Gospel. And if Mr. How can prove from these Words, that those Women were authorised hereby to preach the Gospel publicly, after such an express Prohibition as we have just mentioned, he will do the Quakers a notable Piece of Service. Whatever therefore they did, for the Furtherance of the Gospel, must have been in Private, amongst their own Sex. But the Business of those *Συνεργοι*, or *Συζυγοι*, Fellow-Labourers, was to preach the Gospel in Publick, and to be Governors of Churches, wherever they should be left in any City or Plaec for that

<sup>a</sup> 1 Tim. ii. 12.

<sup>d</sup> Phil. iv. 3.



that Purpose, by him, or any other of the Apostles, as many of them accordingly were. Thus Timothy at Ephesus, Titus at Crete, James at Jerusalem, Epaphroditus at Philippi, Archippus at Colosse, Dionysius the Areopagite at Athens, Polycarp at Smyrna, Antipas at Pergamus, Gaius at Thessalonica, Crescens in Galatia or Gallia, Evodius and Ignatius, one after the other, at Antioch, and Erastus at Corinth. But, as to Philippi, it seems, Epaphroditus is not the Person whom St. Paul, in his Epistle to the Philippians, calls his true Yoke-Fellow. “<sup>d</sup> It happens to fall out crossly now, says Mr. How, that this Yoke-Fellow was somebody else, and not Epaphroditus, who was at Rome with the Apostle—but some other good Christian at Philippi.” In Answer to this I must observe, first, that St. Paul is not used to such an obscure way of Writing, as must be unintelligible both to Epaphroditus and every Body else. For if there were any particular extraordinary Person then residing at Philippi, whom he had a Mind to distinguish, it was his Way always to salute them by Name; as must be manifest to every one that will peruse the last Chapters of many of his Epistles. And thus, as Archippus was in the same Station at Colosse, as Epaphroditus at Philippi, the Apostle, intending to distinguish him, does not bid the Colossians *say to my true Yoke-Fellow*, meaning a Person he had never mentioned before in the whole Epistle; but *say to Archippus, Take heed, &c.* And here in the Verse foregoing <sup>f</sup>, *I beseech Euodias, I beseech Syntiche*. And <sup>e</sup> *I intreat thee also, true Yoke-Fellow*. If this true Yoke-Fellow was any Body else but Epaphroditus, mentioned <sup>h</sup> before in this Epistle with great Encomiums, and stiled by the Apostle, His Bro-

<sup>d</sup> Episc. P. 91.    <sup>e</sup> Col. iv. 17.    <sup>f</sup> Phil. iv. 2.    <sup>g</sup> Ib. v. 3.    <sup>h</sup> Ib. ii. 25.

Brother, and Companion in Labour, and Fellow-Soldier, and, here, true Yoke-Fellow, which means the same Thing, was it not very strange that St. Paul should not name that Person, as well as Eudodias and Syntiche, in Contrariety to his constant Manner of Writing? It must then be Epaphroditus mentioned before with those honourable Titles, to whom the Apostle addresses himself in the aforementioned Words. And, to this, Grotius adds another Reason: “<sup>1</sup> Whom, says he, could St. Paul more properly style his Collegue at Philippi, than him who was at the Head of the Presbytery there; who had the greatest Influence among them in the Disposition of their Charity? The Apostle therefore, by a Figure called *Αποσροφη*, turns his Discourse to Epaphroditus; as he would be present at the Reading of this Epistle, in the Church at Philippi. Neither does *Συζυγος*, here, signify any Thing else than *Συνεργος* before.” And it may be further considered, that <sup>k</sup> there could be no Absurdity in St. Paul’s inserting in his Epistle this Exhortation to Epaphroditus, who might possibly be present at the very writing of it; as it would give him the greater Weight with those to whom it was to be read. I hope I have made it appear, now, that this Yoke-Fellow was Epaphroditus, the Person so styled by St. Paul, a little before; and not some <sup>l</sup> other good Christian whom neither Epaphroditus, nor any Body else, would be able to find out from any such general Expressions as these. But it seems “<sup>m</sup> the *Αποστολοι Εκκλησιων* “ too

<sup>1</sup> Quem autem Philippis potius Collegam vocaret Paulus quam τῶν Πρεσβυτέρων προϊστάμενα, cujus summa erat etiam in Pecuniis elargiendis Auctoritas? Ad Epaphroditum ergo per *Αποσροφη* vertit se Oratio, tanquam præsentem futurum, ubi Epistola hæc in Ecclesia Philippiensium legeretur. Nec aliud hic *Συζυγος*, quam supra *Συνεργος*. Grot. in Phil. iv. 3. <sup>k</sup> See Wolfius ad Phil. iv. 3. <sup>l</sup> Episc. P. 93. <sup>m</sup> Ib. P. 95.

“ too must be no more than mere Messengers, of  
 “ Persons sent by the Churches, to represent  
 “ them, execute a Trust, or transact any Business  
 “ in their Name.” And to prove all this he says,  
 that “<sup>a</sup> the Apostle expressly speaks of one of  
 “ those Brethren, whom he sent to Corinth with  
 “ Titus, as chosen of the Churches to travel with  
 “ him with the Grace or charitable Contribution  
 “ they were carrying to Jerusalem.” As a Proof  
 then that all these Αποστολοι Εκκλησιων were so de-  
 nominated from their being called the Messengers  
 of the Churches in our Translation, he unhappily  
 mentions one, whom<sup>o</sup> all the Churches chose to  
 travel with St. Paul, &c. This single Person then  
 carried the Money, collected from all the Churches  
 (that is, of St. Paul’s planting) himself alone,  
 except one, i. e. the Philippians. Consequently  
 he was the sole Αποστολος, or Messenger of all the  
 Churches, except that of Philippi. What then  
 becomes of the other Αποστολοι Εκκλησιων ? They,  
 according to our Author’s Rule, could have no  
 Connection with, or Relation to any Church what-  
 ever ; because all the Churches chose one only  
 Brother, to carry the Charity Money collected by  
 them all. Whence it follows, that, as one single  
 Person served to carry all the Money that was sent  
 by all the Churches, so no other Person was chose  
 by any of those Churches : And for this very good  
 Reason ; because they had no Occasion for more.  
 But yet these other Persons were the Αποστολοι Εκ-  
 κλησιων for all that : And the Reader will easily see  
 that the Churches had no Hand in making them  
 so. It appears then, that this Brother was one of  
 St. Paul’s Collegues, or Συνεργοι, one of the Απο-  
 στολοι Εκκλησιων, of those who were actually, as E-  
 paphroditus, or were designed by him to be Go-  
 vernors of the several Churches he had planted.

He



He was not a Collegue or Fellow-Labourer of St. Paul's, because he was chose of the Churches to carry their Money; but because he was chose by the Apostle into the Number of his Collegues, the *Αποστολοι Εκκλησιων*. And, upon that Score, the Apostle sent him where he pleased; as he did Titus and others of the like Degree: And particularly upon this Errand; because he was held in more than ordinary Reputation by the Churches who intrusted him with their Charity. *He was<sup>r</sup> the Brother whose Praise was in the Gospel throughtout all the Churches.* Our Apostle likewise thought fit to send another Brother<sup>s</sup>, *whom, says he, we have oftentimes proved diligent in many Things; but now much more diligent, upon the great Confidence which I have in you.* Now from hence we find that this Brother was not sent to Corinth, because the Corinthians chose him any more than they did Titus or St. Luke; but because he was found to be a Man of great Merit and Value, and thought worthy to be invested with the same high Character as Titus, and the other Collegues of St. Paul were, *whom, says he, we have oftentimes proved diligent in many Things; but now much more diligent.* From what has been here said I conclude that, whereas Mr. How says these Persons, or *Αποστολοι Εκκλησιων*, were sent by the Churches to represent them, to execute a Trust, &c. the Churches sent no Body to represent them at all, or transact any Business in their Names at all; they only chose one who had his Mission from St. Paul; that Brother, St. Luke, or whoever he was, as him they liked best of all St. Paul's Collegues, with whom to intrust the Money they had collected. But St. Paul sent<sup>r</sup> three to Corinth, Titus, St. Luke, and another (for they had neither chose any Body,

<sup>r</sup> 2 Cor. viii. 18.

<sup>s</sup> Ib. v. 22.

<sup>r</sup> Ib.

<sup>s</sup> 2 Cor.

viii. 16. & Chap. ix. 1—6.

Body, nor sent any Money yet) to excite them to give liberally; lest they should put him to Shame for his confident Boasting of their Generosity. It is evident that these three Persons were St. Paul's Collegues, or Συνεργοι, Part of the Αποστολοι Εκκλησιων. And, upon Account of their being Men of such high Rule and Dignity in the Church, the Apostle reminds them, that what they were doing would be done in the Sight of these eminent Persons; and, as it were, in the Presence of all the Churches: Not because these Persons represented each his Church; which could not be; for St. Luke represented them all, if the carrying their Money may be said to represent them; but because, when three Persons of such Note were sent to them for that Purpose, it could not be a Secret, whether they gave generously or not. *Wherefore, says he, shew ye to them, and before the Churches, the Proof of your Love, and our Boasting on your Behalf.* For a Transaction, wherein such great Men were concerned, must be known to all the Churches, at least, those of St. Paul's Planting. The Result of all this is, that these Αποστολοι Εκκλησιων were not Persons sent by the Churches to represent them in any Wise; but Persons invested with the highest Degree of Eminence in the Church by that Apostle, i. e. the being his Collegues and Fellow-Labourers, sent by him occasionally to the Churches of his own Planting, and afterwards, by him too, fixed, each, in their several Sees, as he himself particularly informs us with Regard to Epaphroditus, Archippus, Erastus, Timothy, Titus, and Crescens: And the early Church Historians mention many more. Our Translators therefore certainly mistook St. Paul's Meaning, when they rendered the Word Αποστολος *Messenger*, and not *Apostle*. Because the Word *Messenger*, by itself, does

does not carry with it that Idea which is always affixed to the Word Apostle. And no Wonder they should mistake sometimes in so great a Work as the translating the whole Bible must be ; for, allow them to be never so learned, yet they were but Men. And whoever should deny they have committed Mistakes, would be derided by all those who understand the original Languages in which those Books were written. But now we come down beyond the Scripture History ; Only I would first observe, that Mr. How, after having discoursed a While upon that " Text, wherein our Lord forbids his Disciples to exercise such Sort of Dominion over one another as the Heathens did, concludes that " " this Equality of the Apostles does " not of itself prove that there must be a Parity " among the stated Pastors of the Church." And this is very true. But whether we have shewn from Scripture, that the Apostles never did establish such a Parity, must be left to the Reader to determine. And therefore now we come to the Writers of the two first Centuries. Amongst these Clemens Romanus deservedly holds the first Place : And with Regard to him Mr. How observes, that \* " it is absurd to suppose that this " Writer intended any Parallel at all between the " Jewish and Christian Church ; because, on the " one Hand, we should make him draw a Parallel between the Jewish High-Priest, Priests, " and Levites, and one particular Congregation ; " or else he is made to plead for a Pontifex Maximus, or a Pope." According to this Writer's Scheme of Church Government indeed there could not be much Analogy between the Jewish and Christian Church. But he may consider that the Jewish Church had but one High-Priest, be-

K 2

cause

\* Matt. xxv. 26, 27.

v Episc. P. 103.

z Ib. P. 1104



cause that whole Kingdom was not so widely extended, but that it might easily be united in one Body; so that the Holy Land has been always considered as one Diocese, over which the High-Priest was set in the Jewish, as the Bishop in the Christian Church. And in this Light St. Jerom understood it, when he says <sup>y</sup>, "What Aaron and his Sons, and the Levites, were in the Temple, the same may the Bishops, Priests, and Deacons claim to be in the Christian Church: Whereby we know that the apostolical Traditions were taken from the Old Testament." The Jewish Church then bears no Proportion with the two Extremities of Popery or Presbytery: But it does with that golden Mean which bears (<sup>z</sup> as Bishop Overall observes) "the true Portraiture and Lineaments of God's own Ordinance above mentioned; containing in it diverse Degrees of Priests, agreeable, not only to the Constitution of the Jewish Church but, to the very Order and Light of Nature; some superior to rule, and some inferior to be ruled; as, in all other Societies and civil States, it hath been ever accustomed." If then the High-Priest tallies with neither Pope nor Independent, he must, says Mr. How, be considered "<sup>a</sup> as a Type of Christ, which is the Scripture Account of the Matter." And that is very true. "<sup>b</sup> But then this leaves you only two Orders subordinate to him, Presbyters and Deacons, answering to the Jewish Priests and Levites; and so spoils your whole Scheme; which makes another Order of High-Priests, and Multitudes of them." No. Our Scheme

<sup>y</sup> Ut sciamus Traditiones Apostolicas sumptas de veteri Testamento, quod Aaron et Filii ejus atque Levitæ in Templo fuerunt, hoc sibi Episcopi, Presbyteri, et Diaconi vendicent in Ecclesia. Hier. Ep. 58. ad Evag.

<sup>z</sup> Overall's Convoc. Book, P. 155.

<sup>a</sup> Episc. P. 110.

<sup>b</sup> Episc. ib.

is not spoiled by this at all. For our Lord himself, whilst he lived, was Bishop of his own Church; and there never were any more than three Orders of Men in it. When he left this World, he left his Apostles to succeed him in the Government of his Church; and they the Bishops to succeed them for the same Purpose, as has been before observed. So that in and after our Lord's own Time, down to this Day, have there been, without Interruption, three different Orders of Men employed about holy Things in his Church. It is a Pleasure to me to find the great Hooker of the same Sentiments; as some Men may think it becomes them to submit their Judgments to that of so very learned a Man as he: "Bishops are now as High-Priests were then, in Regard to Power over other Priests; and, in Respect of Subjection unto High-Priests, what Priests were then, the same now Presbyters are by Way of their Place under Bishops." Thus far Mr. Hooker; whereby the Reader may perceive that the Jewish and Christian Forms of Church Government tally a little more exactly than Mr. How seems to care they should. For<sup>d</sup>, as from the Beginning there was a Church, so there was a Ministry; the essential Parts of whose Office consisted in these three Duties, viz. Preaching of the Word, Administration of the Sacraments, and Authority of ecclesiastical Government. These three essential Parts of the Ministry were in no Sort abolished by the Death of Christ, but only translated from the Priesthood under the Law to the Ministry under the New Testament. For if our Saviour Christ, or his Apostles, had meant to have erected, in the Churches amongst the Gentiles, any other Form of ecclesiastical Government than God himself had

K 3

set

\* Hook. Eccl. Pol. B. 7. Sect. 18.  
Book, P. 153, 154, and 161.

<sup>d</sup> See Overall's Convoc.

set up amongst the Jews; they would have done it assuredly in a very solemn Manner, that all the World might have taken publick Notice of it; considering with what Majesty and Authority the said Form was erected at God's Commandment by his Servant Moses. But in that they well knew how the Form of the old ecclesiastical Government, in Substance, was still to continue, and to be, in Time, established in every national Kingdom and sovereign Principality among Christians; as soon as they should become for Number sufficient Bodies, and ample Churches to receive the same; as before the like Opportunity it was not established amongst the Israelites; they did, in the mean While, and as the Time did serve them, attempt the erecting of it in such Sort, and by such fit and convenient Degrees, as by the Direction of the Holy Ghost they held it most expedient, without Intermission, till such Time as the Work was, in Effect, accomplished. But now we come to Clemens Romanus; of whom Mr. How says\*, "there is as much Reason to suppose  
 " Clemens Romanus intended a Parallel between  
 " the Orders of the Christian Ministry and the  
 " Officers of the Army," as with the Jewish High-Priest, &c. But the Reader will easily see here, that the Apostle Clemens is not comparing the Numbers, but the Subordination of the inferior Officers in the Church to the superior; even as it is in the Army. For that "all are not Colonels, " all are not Captains, &c." And it is plainly to be perceived that the Writer says this by Way of Illustration only, not as the Foundation, whereupon he grounds his Argument. Another Passage, quoted by Mr. How, is where it is said, that  
 " the

\* Episc. P. 110.  
 xoi, &c.

† Ου πάντες εἰσὶν ἡγέται, οὐδὲ χιλιάρχοι,



“ the Apostles, preaching through Countries  
 “ and Cities, constituted their first Fruits, being  
 “ approved by the Spirit, for Bishops and Dea-  
 “ cons.” If he had said here Presbyters and  
 Deacons, he had said right. For the Word *Επισκοπος*  
 was not yet appropriated to the highest Or-  
 der of the Clergy. So that neither does this Pas-  
 sage prove any Thing; and all he has said, for two  
 or three Pages together, amounts to nothing at all.  
 And that the Word *Επισκοπος* means no more in  
 this Passage than a Presbyter, is plain from his call-  
 ing Bishops by the Words *Ηγουμενους* and *Προηγουμε-  
 νους*, as we shall see presently. The next Quotation  
 we find out of this Author is one that I am persua-  
 ded Mr. How would never have called to his Aid,  
 if he had considered what he was doing: For it  
 most clearly points out to us a superior Order  
 of Men in the Church to his *Επισκοποι*. The  
 Passage is this: “ Wherefore, says he, we  
 “ cannot think that those may justly be thrown  
 “ out of their Ministry, who were constituted  
 “ either by them (the Apostles) or other emi-  
 “ nent Persons.” But who were these *Ανδρας*  
*ελλογιμοις*, or Men of great Account, that or-  
 dained these Presbyters and Deacons? Were they  
 of no Order in the Church? Or were they of the  
 same Order with the Presbyters and Deacons  
 whom they ordained? This last could not be:  
 For, if these eminent Men were endued with no  
 higher Powers and Privileges than the Presbyters  
 had, what Occasion was there for applying to  
 them for Ordination after the Departure or De-

K 4

cease

† Episc. P. 111. Κατα χώρας και πολεις κηρυσσονται καθιγαγον-  
 τας Απαρχας αυτων, δοκιμασαντες τω πνευματι, εις Επισκοπους η  
 Διακονους. Clem. Rom. Cap. 42. <sup>h</sup> Τους ουκ κατασταδευτας  
 υπ εκεινων, η μεταξυ υφ επιρων ελλογιμων Ανδρων—τουτους ου δικαιως  
 νομιζομεν αποβαλεισθαι της λειτουργιας. Clem. Rom. Ep. 1. Sect.  
 40. Episc. P. 114.

cease of the Apostles ? As some were ordained by the Apostles, and some by eminent Men afterwards. Why could not the Presbyters that were left upon the Spot by the Apostles, ordain other Presbyters, without the Help of one or other of these ελλογίμοι Ανδρες, these great Men ? Now it plainly appears they could not. From whence it follows that these Men were of a superior Order to the ordinary Presbyters of the Church ; because they were endued with Powers which those Presbyters had not. And accordingly this holy Father makes such a Distinction between them in more than one Place. For in his first Chapter, whilst he is praising them for their former good Behaviour, how that they walked according to the Laws of God, <sup>n</sup> “ being subject, says he, to those “ who had the Rule over you, and giving the “ Honours that are fitting to the Presbyters which “ are amongst you.” And in another Place he says, <sup>o</sup> “ Let us honour those who are set over us ; “ let us pay Respect to the Presbyters that are a- “ mongst us.” Here, says Bishop Beverege, these Præpositi are distinguished from the Presbyteri ; and are every-where preferred before them. It is no Objection to all this, that the ηγουμενοι are mentioned in the plural Number, and therefore cannot mean a Bishop in our Sense of the Word, as there could be but one in a City ; for Corinth was a Metropolitan Church, and had all Achaia under its Jurisdiction ; as appears from what St. Paul says ; for in his 2d Epistle he writes to <sup>p</sup> the Church which is at Corinth, with all the Saints which are in all Achaia. Whereby we see he includes all the Saints

<sup>n</sup> Υποτασσόμενοι τοις ηγουμενοις υμων, η τιμη την καθηκουσαν απονι-  
μουντες τοις παρ υμων Πρεσβυτεροις. Clem. Rom. Ep. i. Sect. i.

<sup>o</sup> Τοις προηγουμενοις ημων αιδοισθμεν, τοις Πρεσβυτεροις ημων τιμη-  
σωμεν.

<sup>p</sup> 2 Cor. i. 1. See Rom. xv. 26. 2 Cor. ix. 2.

Saints which are in all Achaia, as united in the Church at Corinth, which was their Metropolitan Church, even as it was the Capital of the Province, under the Roman Governor; and therefore had other Bishops within his Jurisdiction. I cannot but observe upon the first of these two Passages, how different the Author's Style is when he speaks of the Bishops, and when of the Presbyters. *Προτασσομενοι*, says he, being subject to your Bishops; but to Presbyters only paying *Τιμην καθηκουσαν*, the proper Respect. The Reader cannot but see that Clemens looked upon the Presbyters in a lower Light than he did the Bishops. And all this confirms the Meaning of that famous Passage to be as Mr. Forster represented it. It is this: <sup>1</sup> "For the  
 " chief Priest has his proper Services; and to the  
 " Priests their proper Place is appointed. And to  
 " the Levites appertain their proper Ministries: And  
 " the Layman is confined within the Bounds of  
 " what is commanded to Laymen. Let every  
 " one of you therefore, Brethren, bless God in his  
 " proper Station." Here, the sacred Ministry of the Jewish Church is so particularly described in all the Orders and Offices of it, and so closely applied to the Christian Dispensation upon it, that an impartial Reader would rather infer from this Place alone, that three Orders might rationally be concluded, as well in one as the other, than imagine that Clemens had the least Thought of no more than two Orders in either. This Father therefore is so far from being subversive of our Scheme, that the Episcopal Order is, in many Places, clearly distinguished from the inferior ones. And it plainly appears, that these *ελλογιμοι Ανδρες*,  
 who

<sup>1</sup> Τω γαρ Αρχιερι ιδιαι Λειτουργιαι δεδομεναι εισιν, και τοις Ιερευσι  
 ιδιος ο Τοπος προτιτακται, και Λευιταις ιδιαι διακονιαι επιτινται· ο λαι-  
 κος Αιθιωπος τοις λαικοις προγαγμασιν διδεται. Εκατος υμων, αδελφοι,  
 εν τω ιδιω ταγματι ευχαρισιτω Θεω. Clem. ad Cor. Ep. 1. Sect.  
 40, 41.



who ordained those Presbyters, are no other than the *ἐγκληματα* and *προπαινεματα* whom Clemens advises his Corinthians to revere so much; and differ nothing from what he means by *Τα Ἀρχιερεῖς*, &c. But here our Author observes, that as to "the Temple Service and Ministry's being the Model of the Ministry and Worship of the Christian Church; not a Word, says he, can I find." But, however, a Line or two after, he is forced to acknowledge that our "Lord had some Regard to the Jews, in chusing twelve Apostles; but that the Reason for it was only temporary and provisional, while the Jewish State and Church continued." Now what our Author means here by *provisional* I cannot understand; but, I know that our Lord told his Apostles thus: *When the Son of Man shall sit upon the Throne of his Glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve Thrones, judging the twelve Tribes of Israel.* However this Passage be to be interpreted, I will venture to say thus far, that neither has our Lord as yet sat upon the Throne of his Glory, in the Sense here meant; neither have the Apostles yet sat in Judgment upon the twelve Tribes of Israel. And; if so, our Lord, in fixing the Number of the Apostles, must have Respect to something future, relating to the twelve Tribes of Israel, and not their then present State: And therefore his Design in it must be more than temporary in Mr. How's Sense. But says Mr. How, "If in any Instance Christ adopted Customs in Use among the Jews; and converted them to different Purposes, as in Baptism and the Lord's Supper; it does not follow that he intended to form his Church upon the Jewish Model." True; if these Instances were rare, and very few in Number: But if there

is

\* Episc. P. 118.

\* Episc. Ib.

\* Matt. xix. 28.

\* Episc. Ib.

is no one Institution or Custom introduced by Christ or his Apostles into the Christian Church, but what has a like Institution or Custom correspondent to it in the Jewish Church, (which appears to me to be the Truth of the Case) I think myself authorised to conclude from thence, that the Constitution of the Jewish Church was to be the Model of the Christian, agreeably to far the greater Part of those Authors, ancient and modern, who have wrote upon this Subject. Of which it were easy to bring Testimonies as the Learned well know. But, says Mr. How, if you would frame the Church of Christ upon the Jewish Model, you must confine yourself wholly to the Mosaick Institutes. But this is a very great Mistake. For by the Law, in our Saviour's Time, was meant not only the Law of Moses, strictly speaking, contained in the Pentateuch, but the whole Jewish Bible, received as sacred, and of divine Authority, and, of Consequence, a Law to them, as much as the five Books of Moses; as we shall see immediately. Our Lord, quoting a Passage in the Psalms, introduces it with saying, *"Is it not written in your Law, I said ye are Gods?"* This Passage is taken out of the lxxxiid Psalm, ver. 6. The Psalms therefore were reckoned by our Lord as Part of the Jewish Law. And again, *"But this cometh to pass that the Word might be fulfilled that is written in their Law: They hated me without a Cause."* These Words are found in Psalm lxix. 4. And not only the Psalms, but the Writings of the Prophets are styled the Law by the Apostles. *"In the Law,"* says St. Paul, *it is written, With Men of other Tongues and other Lips will I speak unto this People, and yet, for all that, will they not hear me saith the Lord.* These Words are taken out of Isaiah xxviii. 11, 12. and yet it is called the Law. And why?

▼ John x. 34.

✱ lb. xv. 25.

▼ 1 Cor. xiv. 21.

why ? Because every Book of the Old Testament was Part of the Jews canonical Scripture ; and consequently as much a Law to them as the five Books of Moses. And this is the Reason why our Saviour joins together the Law and the Prophets ; because whatever any of them delivered was of the same Obligation to the Jews. <sup>a</sup> *Whatever, says he, you would that Men should do unto you, do ye even so to them : For this is the Law and the Prophets.* Hence it is plain our Lord understood the Books of the Prophets to be as much a Law to the Jews as the Books of Moses. As therefore the Law was to be a <sup>a</sup> Schoolmaster to lead us unto Christ ; so the Jewish Ritual was a Plan or Sketch of the Christian, preparative to it, and corresponding with it, as the Shadow corresponds to the Substance. A Proof of which we have in that our Lord adopted into his Church no one Usage, or Custom, or Rite, but what was in Practice at the Time he lived amongst the Jews : And there was this very good Reason to be given for it, viz. that the Transition, from the Jewish to the Christian Religion, might be the more easy to the Converts amongst the Jews ; when they should see that the Constitution of their Church was designed as a Model of that which the Apostles preached ; and <sup>b</sup> that Christianity is nothing but mystical, or reformed Judaism. But now we come to the holy Martyr Ignatius, than whom I know not any one in all Antiquity, who carries the Episcopal Dignity to a greater Height, or sets the Distinction between Bishops and Presbyters in a stronger Light. But, notwithstanding that, Mr. How thinks Ignatius means only a Congregational Bishop. In Proof of which he observes, “ <sup>c</sup> that both the Charge “ and the Rank of Bishop Damas seem to be very “ different

<sup>a</sup> Matt. vii. 12.  
tory Discourse, P. 58.

<sup>a</sup> Gal. iii. 24.

<sup>b</sup> See Hicks's preparatory

<sup>c</sup> Episc. P. 124.



“ different from those of a Diocesan. The Dio-  
 “ cese here appears to be but a very small one, of  
 “ one Congregation, a Church in one Town;  
 “ where it may be justly supposed the Christians  
 “ were but a small Part of the Inhabitants.” In  
 Answer to which let it be considered, first, that at  
 the least we have here a Bishop who had the sole  
 Power of Ordination confined to him, and who  
 had the Government of the Church of Magnesia  
 committed to him, with more than one Presbyter  
 under him, together with a Deacon. In Ignatius’s  
 Time, therefore, there were three Orders of Men  
 in the Church, i. e. those of Bishop, Priest, and  
 Deacon: The highest of which, the Episcopal,  
 had some particular Powers annexed to it, which  
 the Presbyters had not: And they likewise had  
 Powers which the Deacons had not. But this Bi-  
 shop was over one Town only, where we cannot  
 suppose many Christians were got together; and  
 so consisted of but one Congregation. Now Mag-  
 nesia was not a Town, but a City, and, at that  
 Time, a great one too; if we may believe Cella-  
 rius, who calls it *clara Urbs*, a famous City:  
 And Van Egmont, who had been upon the Spot,  
 tells us that “ the Ruins of the ancient City co-  
 “ ver so large an Extent of Ground, as conveys  
 “ a grand Idea of it.” I could say more to prove  
 this City to have been a very great one: But, since  
 our Author compares it to Smyrna, and other great  
 and populous Cities of Asia, I shall leave it to the  
 Reader to judge whether such a City had but one  
 Congregation at the Beginning of the second Cen-  
 tury, when, in *St. Paul’s Time*, almost all Asia  
 was become Christian. And, besides the City it-  
 self, there was a certain Portion of Territory round  
 it (the same which every City enjoyed) under its  
 “ Juris-

\* Cellar. Geogr. Vol. I. P. 54. 4to.      • Van Egmont’s  
 Travels, Vol. I. P. 136.      † Acts xix. 26.

Jurisdiction, over which the Bishop presided as well as over the City. Another Supposition of Mr. How's, about this Church, is, that it had but two Presbyters belonging to it. " Thus, says he, we have a Church, or one Congregation of Christians, at Magnesia, a Bishop, or Pastor, with two Assistants and a Deacon. Mighty large Diocese!" How came Mr. How to know that there were but two Presbyters in the Church of Magnesia? Ignatius mentions but two by Name indeed. But does it follow from thence, that the Church of Magnesia had no more than those two Presbyters belonging to it? If any Person of Quality takes a Journey, attended with only three Persons, is it from thence to be concluded that he carries all his Family with him? And, if the Church of Magnesia thought that two Presbyters and one Deacon were enough to attend their Bishop, does it follow of Consequence that those were all the Presbyters that belonged to such a Number of Christians as must, at that Time, be converted in such a great City? It might as well be said there was but one Deacon; for Ignatius mentions but one by Name. And so says our Author *two Assistants and one Deacon*. Let us see then whether this be true or no. The holy Martyr, after having told the Magnesians that he had, in those Persons (the Bishop, two Presbyters, and one Deacon) seen the whole Multitude of Christians that belonged to their Church, in Faith and Love, adds, " your Bishop presiding in the Place of God; your Presbyters in the Place of the Council of the Apostles; and your Deacons, most dear to me, being intrusted with the Ministry of

<sup>1</sup> Episc. P. 125. <sup>2</sup> Προκαθημένου του επισκοπου εις τον Θρονον, & των Πρεσβυτερων εις τον Συνοδον των Αποστολων, & των διακωνων των εμην γλυκυτάτων υπεπιστευμενων διακονων Ιησου Χριστου. Ign. ad Mag. Sect. 6.

“ of Jesus Christ.” In another Place, the holy Martyr advises the Magnesians to “<sup>b</sup> study to be confirmed in the Doctrine of our Lord and of his Apostles— together, says he, with your most worthy Bishop, and the well-wrought, or worthily complicated, spiritual Crown of your Presbyters; and your Deacons which are according to God;” or, as the Author means, according to the Will of God. But, as Mr. How would have it, this Church with its Bishop, its worthily complicated Crown of Presbyters, and its Deacons according to God, must consist of no more than a Pastor, two Assistants, and a Deacon. And a well-wrought Crown indeed must it be, that consists of two Parts only! But who cannot see Mr. How’s Mistake, or worse, in thus quoting an Author, in Proof of what he directly contradicts in so many Words? I must not here pass by what he quotes out of Owen’s Inquiry; who says that, “<sup>c</sup> in its circular Epistle, the Church of Smyrna gives such an Account of itself as manifests the Church there to have been a very small Number in Comparison of the Multitudes of the other Inhabitants, so as that it was scarcely known who, or what, they were.” And so of the Epistle from the Churches of Vienna and Lyons, it seems, in that Epistle “<sup>d</sup> they make it evident that they bore in Number no Proportion unto the Inhabitants of the Places where they were; who could scarce discover them by the most diligent Search.” This is a most wonderful Account of the State of the Christian Religion indeed: And I am very sure that neither the Church of Smyrna, nor the Churches of Lyons or Vienna, could

<sup>b</sup> Εκούσας οὖν βεβαιώσθαι ἐν τοῖς δόγμασι τοῦ Κυρίου καὶ τῶν Ἀποστόλων— κατὰ τοῦ ἀξιοσημειώτου ἐπισκόπου ὑμῶν, καὶ ἀξιολόγου πνευματικοῦ τέφανου τοῦ Πρεσβυτέρου ὑμῶν καὶ τῶν κατὰ Θεὸν διακόνων. Ib. Sect. 13. <sup>c</sup> Episc. P. 125. <sup>d</sup> Ib.



could ever write any Thing like what Mr. Owen pretends they did. But, before I proceed to the Proof of this Assertion, I will lay before the Reader a small Part of what Eusebius himself, and Tertullian, who flourished about the latter End of the second Century, say upon this Subject. And, first, Tertullian. He says that “ the Christians “ were in such Multitudes every where, as to “ make the greater Part almost of every City.” And again : “ We are of Yesterday, says he, “ yet every Place is filled with us : Your Cities, “ the Islands, the Forts, your Corporations, the “ Councils, the Armies, the Tribes and Compa- “ nies ; yea, the Palace, Senate, and Courts of “ Justice ; your Temples only have we left you “ free. Should we go off and separate from you, “ you’d stand amazed at your own Desolation, be “ affrighted at the Stop and Deadness of Affairs “ amongst you ; and you would have more ene- “ mies than Subjects left you.” Thus far Ter- tullian. Him Eusebius would exceed, if it were possible, in searching for Words to express the Multitudes of Christians there were all over the Roman Empire about the Close of the Apostolick Age. His Words are hardly to be rendered in our Tongue : For the greatest Number of throng- ed and crowded Societies of them are an imperfect Translation of his Original ; and his Comparison for them is this, that they were like heaped Grain upon

• *Tanta hominum Multitudo, Pars pene major Civitatis cu- jusque. Tert. ad Scap. Cap. 2. P. 69. Ed. Rig. Hesterni sumus, & vestra omnia implevimus, Urbes, Insulas, Castella, Municipia, Conciliabula, Castra ipsa, Tribus, Decurias, Pa- latium, Senatum, Forum, sola vobis relinquimus Templum.*— Si tanta vis Hominum in aliquem Orbis remoti Sinum abruptissemus a vobis—proculdubio expavissetis ad Solitudinem vestram, ad Silentium rerum, & Stuporem quemdam quasi mortui Orbis. —Plures Hostes quam Cives vobis remansissent. Tert. Apol. Cap. 37. P. 30. Ed. Rig.

upon a Barn-Floor. “<sup>a</sup> So that in every City  
 “ and Town, says he, Churches were, in a short  
 “ Time, got together, abounding with infinite  
 “ Numbers of People, even as the Grains of Corn  
 “ upon a Threshing-floor.” I cannot forbear add-  
 ing here the Testimony of Pliny in one of his  
 Epistles to Trajan, whilst he was Proconsul of  
 Asia, which was wrote before the Martyrdom of  
 either Polycarp or Ignatius. And certainly he  
 had no Mind to represent the Number of the  
 Christians in his Time to be greater than it really  
 was. After having acquainted the Emperor with  
 his Manner of treating the Christians; and what  
 Sort of People he found them to be, from the best  
 Accounts he could get of them; he says, “<sup>b</sup> It  
 “ seems to me to be a Matter that deserves to be  
 “ much considered; chiefly because of the great  
 “ Numbers of People that are obnoxious. For  
 “ many of all Ages and Degrees, and of both  
 “ Sexes too, are and will be brought into Danger;  
 “ as this pestilent Superstition has spread itself  
 “ not only over Cities and Towns, but even the  
 “ meanest Country Villages, which are infected  
 “ with it.” A little after, he says that “<sup>c</sup> the  
 “ Heathen Temples were almost forsaken.” And  
 now, after all this, Can any one imagine it pos-  
 sible for Eusebius to contradict himself and other  
 Authors of the greatest Credit, as well Heathen as  
 Christian, in so notorious a Fact as the Conversion  
 of such Multitudes to Christianity must be? I have  
 read over the circular Epistle of the Church of  
 L Smyrna,

<sup>a</sup> Καὶ ὅσα ἀνα πάσας πόλεις τι καὶ κώμας, πληθύνουσι; ἀλλοὺς  
 δίκην μυριαυτοῦ καὶ πεμπληθὺς ἀθροὺς ἐκκλησιαίαι συνεστῆσαν. Euseb.  
 Lib. II. C. 3. P. 48. <sup>b</sup> Visa est enim mihi res digna Con-  
 sultatione, maxime propter periclitantium Numerum. Multi  
 enim omnis Ætatis, omnis Ordinis, utriusq; Sexus etiam vocan-  
 tur in Periculum, & vocabuntur. Neque enim Civitates tan-  
 tum, sed Vicos etiam atque Agros superstitionis istius Con-  
 tagio pervagata est. Plin. Epist. L. X. Ep. 98. <sup>c</sup> Plin. Ep.  
 ubi supra.

Smyrna, as it is in Eusebius, and as we have it intire among the Works of the Patres Apostolici : And in neither of these can I find a Word that in the least indicates a Paucity of Christians in that City. In Eusebius's Account of the Martyrs of Vienne and Lyons, taken out of their Epistle, which I have likewise perused with Care, more than once, I can find Reason to think the Christians were very numerous in those Cities ; but no Grounds to imagine they were so few as <sup>k</sup> *scarce to be discovered by the most diligent Search*. They were ordered by the Roman Governors to <sup>l</sup> *keep in their Houses, and not to appear abroad any where*. And is it a Reason for there being but few Inhabitants in a Place, that they were all enjoined not to stir out of their Houses ? <sup>m</sup> And, when the Heathens burnt the Remains of the slaughtered Martyrs, and threw their Ashes into the Rhone, that there might not be the least Atom of them left upon the Earth, Is that a Reason why there should be left but a few Christians alive ? And indeed, by this Way of going to work, these Christians could scarce be discovered even by the most diligent Search. Let us now see, whether this Chapter, together with the Introduction to it, does not demonstrate that the Christians were very numerous at that Time. In the Introduction Eusebius says, speaking of the fourth Persecution, “ <sup>n</sup> We “ may easily guess at the Myriads of Martyrs, “ which shone with great Lustre all over the “ World, by what happened to one Nation.” And, in another Place, after having particularly described

<sup>k</sup> Ep. <sup>l</sup> Ως—το καθολου φαινισθαι ημων τινα, αυτοις απειρησθαι εν οποιω δηποτε τοπω. Euseb. Eccl. Hist. Lib. V. Cap. 1. P. 199. Ed. Read. <sup>m</sup> Καιντα κ; αιθαλωδιτα υπο των ανομων κατεσχευθη εις τον Ροδανον ποταμον—οπως μη δι λειψανον αυτων φαινηται επι της γης επι. Euseb. ibid. ad Fin. Cap. <sup>n</sup> Μυριαδας Μαρτυρων ανα την οικουμεινην διαπρεψαι φοχάσμων λαβειν εις, απο των καθ εν ιθνος συμβεβηκοτων, Euf. Proem. ad Lib. V.



described the Torments some Christians suffered, he says " *that a great many were suffocated in Prison.*" Now these great Numbers, that died in Prison, besides the many that were put to Death other Ways, might surely be discovered without any very diligent Search. And, what this Author can mean by his saying these two Churches were *particular Churches* only, I cannot imagine; for it is very certain, that they were not ordinary but Metropolitan Churches, which had other ordinary Churches subject to them. Hear Eusebius again: " *Wherein (that is, Gaul) these two Cities of Lyons and Vienne were Metropolitan Cities, eminently distinguished, for their Greatness, from the other Cities in that Part of the Country.*" And must of Consequence contain great Numbers of Christians. For this Epistle was wrote about the Year 177, whilst Irenæus was Bishop of Lyons. And I cannot think the Number of Christians decreased any where since Tertullian wrote, when they were *almost the greater Part of every City*. But, nevertheless, the other Half, with the Government in their Hands, might make Noise enough to induce one to think the Christians bore no Proportion to them for Numbers, if we knew no better. There are therefore no Intimations in Eusebius of the small Number of the Christians in Lyons or Vienne, or any where else; but a great deal to the contrary. And our Author would do well to consult the Places himself, or somebody for him, that he can trust, the next Time he quotes an ancient Author. And, as to what he says, " *that several more Presbyters*

L 2

" (than

\* *ὅτι ἀποκρίθηται τὰς πόλεις ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ.* Euf. Eccl. Hist. Lib. V. Cap. 1. P. 203. Ed. Read. It is worthy of Remark that Eusebius here uses the superlative Degree; thereby intimating that great Numbers died in Prison. † *Ἡ Μητροπολις ἐπισκοπὴ καὶ παρὰ τὰς ἄλλας τῶν αὐτοῦ διαφερούσαι βιβλῆται, Λαυδύνος καὶ Βιεννα.* Euf. Eccl. Hist. Lib. V. Cap. 1. P. 198. Ed. Read. ‡ Episc. P. 125.

“ (than two) were common to one Congregation  
 “ at that Time of Day ;” this is said without  
 Proof, as did Sir Peter King before him. And I  
 apprehend he cannot prove it : Though, if he  
 could, it would be but of little Help to his Cause ;  
 when it is demonstrated that there must have been  
 many more Christians in one City than could pos-  
 sibly meet together in one Congregation. But re-  
 turn we now to Ignatius, whom Mr. How has  
 quoted in Support of his Congregational Church.  
 The Martyr then, “ ‘ in each Letter, addresses  
 “ himself to the Church itself, as speaking to a  
 “ Congregation of Christians, to a Society which  
 “ he supposes to be frequently assembled together  
 “ for personal Communion. The Church of E-  
 “ phesus he exhorts to this frequent joint Com-  
 “ munion. ‘ For, if the Prayer of one or two  
 “ have so much Efficacy, how much more that  
 “ of the Bishop and the whole Church ! He that  
 “ cometh not to the same Place is puffed up with  
 “ Pride, and hath condemned himself. ‘ Endea-  
 “ vour frequently to meet together to praise and  
 “ glorify God ; for, when you are often together  
 “ in the same Place, the Strength of Satan is bro-  
 “ ken. And then says Mr. How, Is this Talking  
 “ to a Diocese, or Congregation ?” I answer, It  
 is Talking to a Diocese consisting of many Con-  
 gregations, and not of one Congregation only.  
 And let the Reader judge from what has been al-  
 ready said upon that Subject. But the whole Force  
 of the Argument, from these Quotations, lies in  
 the Meaning of the Words *ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό* ; from  
 whence

‘ Episc. P. 126, 127.    ‘ Εἰ γὰρ εἰς καὶ δευτέρου προσευχῇ  
 τοσαύτην ἰσχύϊ ἔχει, πόσω μάλλον ἢ τοῦ Ἐπισκόπου καὶ πάσης τῆς  
 Ἐκκλησίας ; Οὐκ ἔρχομενος ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό, οὗτος ἤδη ὑπερήφανος, καὶ  
 ἑαυτὸν διεκρίνει.    ‘ Σπουδαζήτε οὐκ πυκνότερον συνερχέσθαι εἰς εὐχα-  
 ριστίαν Θεοῦ καὶ εἰς δόξαν. Ὅταν γὰρ πυκνῶς ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό γινώσκει  
 καθαιεῖσθαι αἱ δυνάμεις τοῦ Σατανα. Ignat. ad Ephes. Sect. 5.  
 & 13.

whence Mr. How would needs conclude that the whole Diocese or Bishop's Church assembled together in one Place. But he gives us no Proof that these Words must evidently imply such a Thing; or that the holy Martyr himself could have no other Meaning in them. Whereas the contrary is true: For, when he charges the Church of Smyrna to do nothing without the Bishop, " <sup>u</sup> Let " that Eucharist, says he, be accounted valid with " you, which is celebrated by your Bishop, or by " such an one as he shall authorise to do it; " <sup>x</sup> the Phrase *υπο του Επισκοπου* here signifies what the Bishop does himself, or is done by another under his immediate Inspection. The following Words, *η αν αυτος επιτρεψη*, mean those who are commissioned by him to do it in his Absence. And that this is the true Sense of this Place appears from his Charge to the Magnesians, when he enjoined them to be dutiful to their Bishop: " <sup>y</sup> As the Lord did no- " thing of himself, or by his Apostles, without " the Father; so neither do you without the Bi- " shop and the Presbyters." It is very plain, that the holy Martyr speaks here of our Lord's Acting by himself in Person, or by his Apostles in his Absence; for it is certain that the Apostles did no one Thing whatsoever, of this Kind, whilst he was present with them. Accordingly, Ignatius says that, " <sup>z</sup> whatever he (i. e. the Bishop) does ap- " prove, that is acceptable to God." Whatever is done, in any Part of his Diocese, with his Approbation, God will accept. So that, as the supreme Magistrate is said and owned to do whatever is warrantably done by his commissioned Mi-

L 3

nisters:

<sup>u</sup> *Εκινή βεβαία ευχαριστία ηγείσθω η υπο του επισκοπου υμα, η αν αυτος επιτρεψη.* Ign. ad Smyrn. Sect. 8. <sup>x</sup> See Smith ad Loc. Ed. Ruffel. <sup>y</sup> *Ωσπερ υν ο Κυριος ανευ τε Πατρος μηδεν ιωοησεν, υτι δι αυτου, υτι δια των Αποστολων.* Ig. ad Mag. Sect. 7. <sup>z</sup> *Αλλ ο αν εκεινος δοκιμασθ, τετο η τω Θεω ευαρεσθον.* Ig. ad Smyrn. Sect. 8.



nisters : So a Bishop might and did act by deputed Presbyters, in a Manner very nearly resembling what we call Institution in an episcopal Church, at least as to the Exercising ministerial Offices in it, And that those primitive Bishops could and did assign to Presbyters as well a separate Place, or Places to minister in, as depute them to the Ministry itself, appears from the Words immediately following. For the holy Martyr, after having told us that the Eucharist was effectual when offered by the Bishop, or by him to whom the Bishop has given Commission, immediately adds : “ 7 Wheresoever the Bishop shall appear, there let “ the People also be.” But the People ought to be wherever the Eucharist is administered : And as that may be administered by the Bishop, or by one commissioned by him, so may the Bishop appear in his own Person, or by his Deputy, in the same Manner as our Lord acted by himself, or by his Apostles. And this will help to lead us into the Meaning of the Words *ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό*, when the holy Martyr warns the Magnesians “ 2 to “ account nothing for a reasonable Service that “ was done privately,” or in their own private Way ; agreeable to the apostolick Charge, that they “ *should not forsake the assembling themselves together* ; but meet for publick Worship under the proper Minister of their Church ; to avoid Schism and heterodox Opinions. Now, if it had been undeniably proved by any Expressions before, that there neither was nor ought to be any more than one single House of Prayer, or publick Worship, within a Bishop’s Diocese ; and that his personal Ministry was absolutely necessary in all divine Offices ; it might indeed have been

7 Οπου αὖ φαιν ὁ ἐπίσκοπος καὶ τὸ πλῆθος ἐστὶν. Ignat. ad Smyr. Sect. 8.

2 Μὴδε παραστήτε εὐλογεῖν τι φαίνοσθαι ἰδίᾳ ὑμῶν. Ignat. ad Mag. Sect. 7.

2 Heb. x. 25.

been fairly inferred, that they were all obliged to assemble with him, in that one individual Place alone. But since the holy Martyr himself has informed us elsewhere, that the most solemn Offices of publick Worship were valid in themselves, and acceptable to God too, when performed by any Person whom the Bishop should authorise and approve of for that Purpose (as we have already seen) surely, if any particular Number or Society of Christians in that Diocese had assembled for publick Worship, under any Presbyter so allowed and commissioned to officiate for them, they had answered the full Import of the holy Martyr's Charge here given them, against private and clandestine Ways of Worshipping: Or else I cannot see how the Bishop's Approbation and Permission of such a Person could be to any Purpose at all. Justin Martyr has used these same Words; and he lived not fifty Years after Ignatius. He tells us, that “<sup>b</sup> on Sunday, all throughout Cities or Countries “meet together *ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό*.” Now the Sense of these Words can be no other than that it was a general Practice all over the World, wherever there were any Christians, to meet together, each in his respective Place, *ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό*. The Phrase therefore *συνελευσις γινεται ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό*, which properly signifies assembling together, though it is expressed in the singular Number, yet, being spoken with Reference to a complex Body, as it evidently is here, in Relation to Cities and Countries at large, does severally refer to each distinct Member and Part, whereof that complex Body does consist; and plainly denotes that every Part, as well one as the other, did hold an Assembly on that Day; or else that great Absurdity will unavoidably follow, viz. that all made but one As-

L 4

sembly

<sup>b</sup> Παντων κατὰ πόλεις ἢ ἀγρούς μνηστων ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό συνελευσις γινεται. Just. Mart. Apol. 1. P. 37. Ed. Thurl.

sembly in the Whole. So little then can it be inferred that either Justin or Ignatius, by these Words, can mean to confine a Diocese to a single Congregation, or to bring the Christians of whole Cities and Countries together into one and the same Place at once. In the Prayer of the Apostles, after that Peter and John had been threatened by the Jews, we read<sup>a</sup>: “The Kings of the Earth  
“ stood up, and the Rulers were gathered together  
“ against the Lord, and against his Christ.” These Words the Apostles explain in the following Verse, thus<sup>b</sup>: “For, of a Truth, against thy holy Child  
“ Jesus, whom thou hast anointed, both Herod  
“ and Pontius Pilate, with the Gentiles and the  
“ People of Israel, were gathered together.” From hence, according to our Author, we must conclude that Herod and Pontius Pilate, the Gentiles and the People of Israel, were gathered against Christ, all in one Place, and at one Time together. The Absurdity of which must be clear to the meanest Capacity. But, after all, these Words, *ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό*, denote a Thing, as well as a Place, in general, according to the known Rule of all such neutral Words as this is. The Commentaries of learned Men upon the holy Scriptures make this appear. Grotius upon Acts iii. 1. interprets *ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό* by *circa idem Tempus, about the same Time*. Beza’s Note upon the same Expression is this: “<sup>c</sup> I think, says he, that the  
“ common Assemblies of the Church, with their  
“ mutual Agreement in the same Doctrine, and  
“ the great Unanimity of their Hearts, are signi-  
“ fied by this Expression.” In the xxxivth Psalm Ver. 3, where the Septuagint uses *ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό*, A-  
quila

<sup>a</sup> Συνηχθῆσαν ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό. Acts iv. 26.

<sup>b</sup> Ib v. 27.

<sup>c</sup> Ego communes Ecclesiæ Cœtus ita existimo significari, cum mutua in eandem Doctrinam Consensione & summa Animorum Concordia. Beza in Act. ii 44. See also Poli Synop. in Loc.



quila renders it by *ομοθυμαδον*; that is, *with one Mind, or one Heart*. See more to this Purpose in Whitby, upon Acts ii. 44. The intelligent Reader, I imagine, sees, by this Time, how inconclusive that Argument must be, which proceeds upon a positive Interpretation of a single Phrase, that is indefinite in its own Nature, and determined to signify far otherwise than Mr. How would have it; and that by Authors of no mean Character in the learned World. But it seems these Bishops can be no other than congregational Bishops, because Polycarp is exhorted to inquire after all by Name, and the like. But the whole Passage will better inform us. “<sup>b</sup> Let not the Widows be neglected; be thou, next to God, their Guardian—Let your Assemblies be more frequent. Inquire after all by Name. Overlook not the Men and Maid Servants.” Upon this our Author observes, that “<sup>c</sup> if Polycarp’s Church was a Congregation at Smyrna, which bore but a small Proportion to the Inhabitants of the City; then he might know all their Names, and inquire after the Absent, and take Care of the Widows.” And so he might, if there were a hundred Congregations in the City of Smyrna, and the Portion of Country depending upon it. For, if Mr. How understands, by those Words, the knowing them personally, he much mistakes the holy Martyr’s Meaning; they being nothing more than a plain Advice to Polycarp to do what the primitive Bishops always did; that is, to keep the Names of every Member of his Church, particularly of the poorer Sort, enrolled in what the Ancients called the *Matricula* of their Church:

<sup>b</sup> Ignat. ad Polyc. Sect. 4. Χρηαι μη αμεισθωσαν. Μιτα τον Κυριον, συ αυτοι φροντισεις εσο.—Πυκνοτερον συναγωγαι γνωσθωσαν εξ ονοματος παντας ζηται. Δουλους και δουλαις μη υπηρεηφανι. <sup>c</sup> Episc. Pag. 128.

Church : For the Occasion of the Words implies it to be so. He just before besought Polycarp not to neglect the Widows of the Church ; and, immediately after, desires him not to overlook so much as the Men-Servants and Maid-Servants in it. And, in the Midst of this (as a Means to know the Quality, Number, and Condition of his Diocese) advises him to inquire out all by Name ; that is, to get such a Register of their Names, that, upon Occasion of any Object of Charity proposed to him, of any Complaint, or Application made to him about any within his Cure or Jurisdiction ; or in Case of Apostacy, or Perseverance, in Time of Persecution, or the like ; by Means of this general Matricula, he, as the other Bishops did, might more directly know how the Case stood with them. And, which was more than all this, their Names being thus entered in this sacred Record, they were personally intitled *then* to all the publick Intercessions, and spiritual Blessings obtained by the eucharistical Prayers, Oblations, and Sacraments of the whole Church. And to have their Names blotted out of this was a constant Effect of Excommunication ; and was dreaded by all that had a true Veneration (as those primitive Christians had) for the Ordinances of the Church. And these were sufficient Reasons for that apostolical Father to mind a Bishop of the Church to be careful of keeping such a Matricula as this ; and an effectual Way for Polycarp to take Care of the meanest and poorest Members of his Diocese : Which the Context tells us was the Occasion of Ignatius's using these Words <sup>d</sup>. But in Regard of there being one  
only

<sup>d</sup> Bingham, speaking of a Name for the Clergy very commonly to be met with in ancient Councils, which was Canonici, because they were all written in a Roll, called *αγιος Κανων* ; by some, Albus ; and Matricula ; says that all others, whose Names were

only Congregation, then, under his Care; and that he must personally know them all by Name; they no more imply it than that Augustus Cæsar had but one Town to command, and could know every Subject he had, when he caused them all to be inrolled, and required the State of his Empire to be brought in to him: For the Censor's Work, in such a Case as that, was to give in an Estimate of the Age, Children, Families, and Estates of all the People under him. For so says Cicero\*, "Let the Censors take an Account of the Ages, Children, Families, and Estates of the People." But, it seems†, "there were many Churches near him (Polycarp) *εμπροσθεν*, even in Conspectu, just before his City." So that he need go no farther than the Gates of it to see half a Dozen Churches. He might indeed see half a Dozen Villages, which possibly might have a Place for divine Worship erected in each of them: But those were not such Churches as Ignatius meant. The Churches, he meant, were Churches of great Cities, who had each their Bishop presiding over many Congregations, having many Presbyters and Deacons under him. And I apprehend that Polycarp could not have in View half a Dozen such Cities as those, by going no farther than the Gates of his own. The Word *εμπροσθεν*, therefore, means a Parte anteriori, or ex Parte adversa; i. e. those Cities which were the foremost, or nearest the Sea upon that Part of the Coast of Asia Minor, which looked to Syria and Antioch. For, says the Martyr,

were set down in the Church's Books, were intitled to receive Maintenance from the Church, and were called by the same Name *Canonici*; such as Virgins, Widows, &c. See also Du Fresne on the Word *Matricula*. Bingham. Ant. Book 1. Chap. 5. Sect. 10. \* *Censores Populi Civitates, Soboles, Familias, Pecuniasq; censento.* Cic. de Leg. Lib. 3. † *Episc.* P. 128.



tyr, “ I could not write to all the Churches :  
 “ Therefore you shall write to those Cities that  
 “ lie foremost, or nearest the Sea, or upon the  
 “ opposite Coast.” He could not mean by *πασαῖς*  
*ἐκκλησιαῖς* all the Churches in Asia Minor : For  
 how could he imagine that they could convenient-  
 ly send to Syria from so great a Distance as some  
 of them were at ? Neither could he mean a few  
 Parishes within Sight of Smyrna ; but by *πασαῖς*  
 he means all those who were likely to send Mes-  
 sengers of Congratulation to Antioch : And as he  
 could not write to them all, but omitted those  
 Churches that were *ἐμπροσθεν*, opposite, or ex Parte  
 adversa, not to Smyrna, but to the Coast of Syria,  
 which lay over-against them across Part of the  
 Mediterranean Sea ; he desires Polycarp to write  
 to them<sup>h</sup>. And thus I hope I have cleared this  
 Passage so far as to satisfy the Reader, that by *ταῖς*  
*ἐμπροσθεν ἐκκλησιαῖς* could not be meant a few single  
 Congregations within Sight of the Gates of Smyr-  
 na. In Page 129, if Mr. How had rendered  
*ἐπισκοπούς* by Presbyters, he had not been much  
 out of the Way, because Clemens calls Bishops  
*ἡγούμενοι* and *προηγούμενοι*. But he goes on to  
 prove that Bishops must be of human Institution,  
 because Ignatius praises the Deacon Sotio for being  
 subject to his Bishop<sup>i</sup>, as to the Grace of God.  
 And what can prove the divine Original of any  
 Order of Men more strongly, than to say that  
 God, of his divine Grace and Favour, did consti-  
 tute a particular Order of Men to be the supreme  
 Governors over it ? For, as to the Schisms Mr.  
 How speaks of, we have before proved them to  
 have happened, and the Remedy applied, in the  
 Apostles

<sup>h</sup> Ἔπει οὖν πασαῖς ταῖς ἐκκλησιαῖς οὐκ ἠδυνήθη γράψαι — γράψαις  
 ταῖς ἐμπροσθεν ἐκκλησιαῖς. Epist. ad Polyc. Sect. 8. <sup>b</sup> See  
 Smith's Not. in Loc. Ed. Kuffel. <sup>i</sup> Ὡς χαρίτι Θεοῦ. Episc.  
 P. 129, 130.

Apostles Times. But as he thinks that, because the Martyr says that <sup>\*</sup> *Presbyters are the Law of Jesus Christ*, therefore that Order is of divine Institution, and not the Episcopal, of whom he said, just before, that they were the Grace of God; let us see whether we cannot find some Expressions, of as much Force, applied to the Order of Bishops. In his Epistle to the Ephesians the holy Martyr says <sup>1</sup>, that “the Bishops, appointed unto “the utmost Bounds of the Earth, are by the “Will of Jesus Christ.” In that to the Trallians he bids them “<sup>n</sup> farewell in Jesus Christ, being subject to your Bishop, as to the Command “of God.” Now I can see no Difference between what is by the Will or Command of God, and what is by the Law of God; for both must have God for their Author. Neither do I think that what is instituted by the Grace of God, comes far short of the other two; for that which takes its Original from divine Grace, must carry divine Authority along with it. In short; all these three Words, *Grace*, *Will*, and *Command*, all mean the same Thing. Therefore all the three Orders of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons are appointed by the positive Will, or Command, or Law, or Grace of God, word it how you will, to their several Stations: The Bishops as supreme Governors, the other two being subject to them, and receiving what Authority they have from them: As we have before proved, and as this holy Martyr will farther inform us. But we are told, that this Subjection to their Bishop is so very earnestly pressed upon the Christians by him; because, “<sup>n</sup> being a “new Thing, some Churches and Christians, at first,

<sup>\*</sup> Episc. P. 129.

<sup>1</sup> Επισκοποι, οι κατὰ τὰ περὶ τὰ ὁρίσθαι, ἢ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ γὰρ ἐστιν. Ignat. ad Ephes. Sect. 3.

<sup>n</sup> Ἐξέωθε ἢ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ; ὑποτασσόμενοι τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ ὡς τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, that is, Θεοῦ.

<sup>n</sup> Episc. P. 130.

“ first, might not be so ready to do it.” Now Mr. How might have found, if he would have taken the Pains to consult the proper Authors, that, at the Time Ignatius wrote these Epistles, he had been Bishop of Antioch forty Years, and Evodius before him for twenty Years at least. So that this City of Antioch and the Churches of Syria had been subject to a Bishop for sixty Years before : Whereby the People must have been pretty much used to episcopal Government ; and none in all that Time, as I ever read or heard of, refused the due Subjection to their Bishop, but Cerinthians, Ebionites, Docetæ, and such-like Hereticks ; against whom these Epistles were chiefly pointed ; and therefore this holy Martyr so earnestly urges Subjection to their Bishop ; because he thought the Unity among Christians could no otherwise be preserved ; and that it was a grievous Crime to make Divisions ; as appears from Abundance of Places in his Epistles. But Mr. How accuses Ignatius of using *“ incautious Expressions.* Now, as he is the only Person, I believe, that ever taxed this holy Martyr with using any Words that did not aptly convey his Meaning, I shall leave it to the intelligent Reader to determine whether it be likely that this great Apostle, who was little less than inspired, if not altogether so, should, whilst on his Way to be sacrificed for the Sake of Christ, leave any Thing in Writing behind him, wherein he had expressed himself in Words that conveyed a different Sense to the Mind of the Reader, than he intended they should. I shall, however, consider a little what he has said in Consequence of this important Observation : “ And yet (says “ Mr. How, notwithstanding these same incautious “ Expressions) there is nothing that intimates any “ Apprehension of the Bishops being a distinct Order

<sup>a</sup> Episc. P. 131.

• Ib.



“ Order from the Presbyters ; nothing of the Episcopacy, as a superior Office of itself ; but, on the contrary, he speaks only of the Person of the Bishop, when he recommends him, but most frequently of the Presbytery (Πρεσβυτεριον) or Office of the Presbyters, as the Institution of Christ, and as having the proper Succession from the Apostles.” In Answer to this, let us see what it is which constitutes a particular Order of Men. And, as far as I am able to judge, it appears that what denominates me to be of such an Order, is my being endowed with particular Powers and Privileges, and called by a Title appropriated to such a Set of Men as are endowed with such particular Powers and Privileges ; be it those of a Bishop, Priest, or Deacon. Therefore, if Ignatius speaks of Bishops, as enjoying such Powers and Privileges as are not allowed to either Presbyter or Deacon, then does he thereby declare that Bishops are a distinct Order of Men from Presbyters or Deacons. But there are various Privileges, which he confines to the Bishops. As, first, a negative Voice in every Thing <sup>p</sup>. “ Let no Man do any Thing separately from the Bishop : ” that is, without his Approbation. “ <sup>q</sup> It is not lawful, without the Bishop, either to baptise, or to celebrate the holy Eucharist : ” That is, none may do those Things without his Permission. And all this is plain from what immediately follows. “ <sup>r</sup> But, whatsoever he shall approve of, that is also pleasing unto God.” Does not Ignatius here describe a Man who executes such an Office, and exerts such Powers as were never enjoyed by either Presbyter or Deacon ? And this,

to

<sup>p</sup> Μηδεις χωρις του επισκοπου τι πρᾶσσειτω. Ignat. ad Smyrn. Sect. 8. <sup>q</sup> Ουκ εστιν χωρις του επισκοπου, ουτε βαπτισιν, ουτε ευχαριστη ποιειν. Ib. <sup>r</sup> Αλλ' ο αν εκεινος δοκιμασῃ τουτο και τω θω ευαριστον. Ib. See Ep. ad Philip. Sect. 7.

to my Apprehension, is no other than making the Bishops a separate Order. Mr. How goes on to observe, that Ignatius “ speaks only of the Person of the Bishop, when he recommends him; “ but most frequently of the Presbytery or Office “ of the Presbyters.” Now, I cannot, for my Life, find out any Meaning in this Observation, except it be that the Church of Smyrna is hereby ordered to be subject to their Bishop, not as Bishop, but as Polycarp, to whom, as being a Person of such extraordinary Endowments, they were in all Reason obliged to submit. But this cannot be; for Ignatius lays down the same Rules of Duty towards the Bishop in every Epistle he has wrote: Particularly in his Epistle to the Philadelphians, he tells them *“ the Holy Spirit said, Do nothing without the Bishop.* In his Epistle to the Ephesians, he says <sup>t</sup>, “ For even Jesus Christ our “ inseparable Life, is sent by the Will of the Father, as the Bishops, appointed unto the utmost “ Bounds of the Earth, are by the Will of Jesus “ Christ. Wherefore it will become you to run “ together according to the Will of your Bishop, “ as also ye do.” In the first of these Passages, it is plain that the Spirit speaks not of any particular Person, with Regard only to those extraordinary Gifts and Graces he was endued with, but as being the Person who at that Time held the Office of a Bishop amongst them, or was their Bishop. And in the latter, our blessed Martyr could not have Respect to the Persons of the Bishops all over the World; for it was impossible for him to know

<sup>t</sup> Το δὲ πνεῦμα ἐνεργεῖσιν λέγων ταῦτα. Χωρὶς τοῦ Ἐπισκόπου μηδεὶς ποιεῖτε. Ignat. ad Phil. Sect. 7. <sup>t</sup> Καὶ γὰρ Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, το ἀδιακρίτον ἡμῶν ζῆν, τοῦ πατρὸς ἡ γνῶμη, ὡς καὶ οἱ ἐπίσκοποι οἱ κατὰ τὰ πλεῖστα ἐσθιόντες, ἐν Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ γνῶμη εἰσιν. Θέειν ὡς περὶ υἱοῦ συνῆλθαι τῇ τοῦ ἐπισκόπου γνῶμη, ὡς καὶ ποιεῖτε. Ignat. ad Ephel. Sect. 3. & 4.

know half of them: So that, in this Place, he speaks of the Office of a Bishop which Christ had appointed for the Government of his Church all over the World. It may not be amiss to remark here, that, at the Time Ignatius wrote these Epistles, the Government of the Churches, all over the World, was in the Hands of such as we now call Bishops, who had Power to commission other inferior Officers, according to the Direction of the Apostles. On the contrary, Mr. How would have Ignatius say, that Presbyters are not only " the " Institution of Christ, but that they have the " proper Succession from the Apostles." In Proof of this he quotes the holy Martyr, as exhorting the Magnesians to regard the *Presbyters* <sup>2</sup> *as presiding in the Place of the apostolical Council.* But he says no such Thing; as we shall plainly see if we peruse the whole Context, of which our Author's Quotation makes but a small Part. " <sup>1</sup> I exhort you, says he, that ye study to do all Things " in a divine Concord; your Bishop presiding in " the Place of God; your Presbyters in the Place " of the Council of the Apostles; and your Deacons most dear to me, being intrusted with the " Ministry of Jesus Christ." Now Mr. How would not quote the former Part of this Passage, because he plainly saw in what a superior Light the Bishop is here put in Comparison of his Presbyters. And, as far as I can remember, whenever we find the Presbyters compared to the Apostles, the Bishop is constantly compared to God or Christ. So that, let our Author talk what he will of the Presbyters presiding in the Place of the

M

Apostles,

<sup>1</sup> Episc. P. 131.  
Αποστόλων.

<sup>2</sup> Τῶν Πρεσβυτέρων ἐν τοῦτον συνέδριον τῶν Παρεόντων ἐν ὁμοφρονίᾳ Θεοῦ σπουδαίετε πάντα πρῶτον, προκαθήμενον τοῦ επισκοποῦ ἐν τοῦτον Θεοῦ, καὶ τῶν Πρεσβυτέρων ἐν τοῦτον συνέδριον τῶν Αποστόλων, καὶ τῶν Διακόνων, τῶν μοι γλυκύτατων ἀντιγεγραμμένων διακονίαν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. Ep. ad Magn. Sect. 6.



Apostles, still the Bishop is put in a superior Station over them, as God or Christ was over the Apostles. And the intelligent Reader will easily see that the holy Martyr must have in his Eye the State of the Apostles, whilst our Lord was upon Earth: They were then his Council, over which he presided; as afterwards the Presbyters were the Bishop's Council, over which he presided, and does so to this Day. For it is impossible the Martyr should here have Respect to the Apostles, after they had their full Commission, and succeeded in the Place of their Master, and each went into his own particular Part of the World: They were no Council then; but each presided separately over a Council of Presbyters appointed by himself, as our Lord did over them; and so the Bishops, succeeding them, do the like. The Presbyters then have no other Succession from the Apostles, than as they are considered as a Council of Presbyters to our Lord, whilst he presided over them upon Earth: As the Presbyters, ever since, have been a Council to the Apostles, and their Successors the Bishops. And all this is still farther proved from the following Passage which our Author has quoted a Piece of, as thus: “<sup>2</sup> He tells the Trallians, that, as they ought to transact nothing without the Bishop, they should also be subject to the Presbytery, as to the Apostles of Jesus Christ.” But the whole Context runs thus: “<sup>2</sup> For, whereas you are subject to your Bishop as to Jesus Christ, ye appear to me to live, not after the Manner of Men, but according to Jesus Christ.—It is therefore necessary that  
“ — as,

<sup>2</sup> Episc. P. 131.

\* Οτ' αν γαρ τω επισκοπω υποτασσισθε ως Ιησου Χριστω, φαισθε μοι ου κατα ανθρωπων ζωντες, αλλα κατα Ιησου Χριστου. — Αναγκαιον ου ειη — ανευ του επισκοπου μηδεν πρασσειν υμας· αλλ' υποτασσισθε και τω πρεσβυτεριω, ως τοις Αποστολοις Ιησου Χριστου. Ignat. ad Trall. Sect. 2.

“ — as, without your Bishop you should do no-  
 “ thing, so also you should be subject to your  
 “ Presbyters, as to the Apostles of Jesus Christ.  
 Here we see again, that, as the Presbyters are com-  
 pared to the Apostles, so is the Bishop to Jesus  
 Christ. Which plainly refers to the State of Christ’s  
 Church whilst he was in this World : For the Peo-  
 ple then were to be ruled by what the Apostles  
 preached, when our Lord sent them out by two  
 and two for that Purpose : And so in like Manner  
 the People are required to have Regard to the  
 Preaching of the Presbyters who are commissioned  
 and sent among them, for that Purpose, by the Bi-  
 shop. And the Comparison here made between  
 our Saviour and his Apostles, and the Bishop with  
 his Presbyters, appears to me to tally so exactly  
 as scarce to be mistook by the meanest Capacity.  
 However, this holy Martyr, we are told <sup>b</sup>, “ always  
 “ speaks of the Bishop and Presbyters, as acting  
 “ jointly.” Our Author means by this, as I sup-  
 pose, that Ignatius never allows his Bishop the  
 Power to do any Thing but in Conjunction with  
 his Presbyters. Let us see then what he really  
 does allow of. “ <sup>c</sup> Let that Eucharist, says he,  
 “ be looked upon as valid, which is offered by  
 “ the Bishop, or by him to whom the Bishop has  
 “ given Permission so to do.” “ <sup>d</sup> Whatsoever  
 “ he shall approve of, that is also pleasing unto  
 “ God.” It appears from hence, as clear as Day-  
 light, that, according to this holy Martyr, the Bi-  
 shop wanted not any joint Concurrence of his Pres-  
 byters, when he had a Mind to empower any Per-  
 son to administer the holy Sacraments. And, in  
 short, that whatever he approved of would be  
 pleasing to God ; without mentioning the least

M 2

Necessity

<sup>b</sup> Episc. P. 131.<sup>c</sup> Εκεινη βασιλεια ευχαριστια ηγισθη, η υπο  
 τον επισκοπον ουσα, η ω αν αυτος επιτελειη.—<sup>d</sup> Αλλ’ ο αν εκεινος

δοκιμαση, τουτο και τω Θεω ευαρεστον. Ignat. ad Smyrn. Sect. 8.

Necessity there was for the Presbyters to ratify what their Bishop had approved of. In these two Instances then the Bishop acted alone, and not jointly with his Presbyters, as our Author would have it. But still there is “<sup>e</sup> Nothing that looks like, or can possibly be reconciled with the Supposition of their (the Presbyters) having separate Churches, or each a distinct pastoral Charge, subject to the Bishop.” Now supposing, but not granting, that there was but one Congregation in one City, what shall we say to the Man that styles himself Bishop of Syria! And this Ignatius does in several Places. “<sup>f</sup> Remember me, says he, — and the Church of Syria, from whence I am not worthy to be called.” “<sup>g</sup> Remember in your Prayers the Church of Syria, from which I am not worthy to be called.” “<sup>h</sup> Give Thanks to the Father through Christ Jesus, that he has vouchsafed to call the Bishop of Syria from the East to the West.” “<sup>i</sup> Remember in your Prayers the Church of Syria, which now enjoys God for its Shepherd instead of me.” Now certainly the whole Province of Syria had more than one Congregation in it: Therefore Ignatius was Bishop, at least, over many who *had separate Churches, or each a distinct pastoral Charge*: And, in Truth, he was the Metropolitan of that Province; for, though the Name was not in Being in our Martyr’s Time, yet the Power of him, who was over the Metropolitan City, extended to all the

<sup>e</sup> Episc. P. 131.

<sup>f</sup> Μνημονεύετε μου — κὴ τῆς ἐν Συρία Ἐκκλησίας, ὅθεν οὐκ ἄξιός εἰμι καλεῖσθαι. Ep. ad Magn. Sect. 14. <sup>g</sup> Μνημονεύετε ἐν ταῖς προσευχαῖς ὑμῶν, τῆς ἐν Συρία ἐκκλησίας· ὅθεν καὶ οὐκ ἄξιός εἰμι λεγέσθαι. ad Trall. Sect. 13. <sup>h</sup> Ἀσπείτε τῷ Πατρὶ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, ὅτι τοῦ Ἐπισκοποῦ Συρίας ὁ Θεὸς κατηξίωσεν εὐρεθῆναι, εἰς δύσιν ἀπο ἀνατολῆς μεταπημφαμένος. ad Rom. Sect. 2. <sup>i</sup> Μνημονεύετε ἐν τῇ προσευχῇ ὑμῶν, τῆς ἐν Συρία ἐκκλησίας, ἥτις ἀπὸ ἐμοῦ ποιμεῖται τῷ Θεῷ χρεῖται. Ib. Sect. 9.



the Churches of that Province in Spirituals; even as that of the Governor did to all the Cities of it, in temporal Things. I must, before I leave this ancient Father, mention one Passage more out of him. It is this<sup>k</sup>: “Wherefore it will become  
 “you not to use your Bishop too familiarly upon  
 “the Account of his Youth; but to yield all Re-  
 “verence to him, according to the Power of God  
 “the Father—as becomes those who are prudent  
 “in God; submitting to him; or rather not to  
 “him, but to the Father of our Lord Jesus  
 “Christ, who is the Bishop of us all.” Here is certainly too great a Distance put between the Bishop and his Presbyters, to suppose they acted jointly together, or that they were upon an equal Footing. The Presbyters were to *submit to him*. They were to act in Subordination to him, from whom they received the Power they had to act as Presbyters. I could here quote many Passages out of this Martyr’s Works to the same Purpose: But, as I imagine that those that are already laid before the Reader sufficiently prove my Point, I shall proceed, along with Mr. How, to consider what Irenæus says. He tells us then, as he has quoted him, that “<sup>l</sup> it is requisite to obey the  
 “Presbyters of the Church, those who have a  
 “Succession from the Apostles, as I shewed before;  
 “who, together with the Succession of the Episcopacy, have received the sure Gift of Truth, according to the good Pleasure of the Father.” It

M 3

ap-

<sup>k</sup> Και υμιν δε περιτι μη συγχρασθαι τη ηλικια του επισκοπου, αλλα κατα δυναμιν Θεου πατρος πασαν εντροπην αυτω απονεμειν ως φρονημους η Θεω συγχωρουτας αυτω ουκ αυτω δε, αλλα τω πατρι Ιησου Χριστου τω παντων επισκοπω. Ign. ad Magn. Sect. 3. Καθως γινωσι και τους αγιους Πρεσβυτερους—As also I perceive that your holy Presbyters do. *lh.*

<sup>l</sup> Quapropter eis qui in Ecclesia sunt, obedire oportet; his, qui Successionem habent ab Apostolis, sicut ostendimus; qui, cum episcopatus Successione, Charisma Veritatis certum, secundum Placitum Patris, acceperunt,

appears from this Passage that the Obedience Irenæus speaks of was not to be paid to every Presbyter, but to those only who had the Succession from the Apostles. And it appears farther, that those who had the Succession from the Apostles were such only as had the episcopal Office conferred upon them, or were Bishops. But it seems these Bishops were still <sup>b</sup> “no more than mere Presbyters; only primi  
“inter Pares.” Let us then see whether this Notion of a Bishop be agreeable to that of Irenæus. Hear then what he says <sup>i</sup>: “We can reckon up to  
“you, says he, both those who were instituted Bi-  
“shops in the Churches by the Apostles them-  
“selves; and those who succeeded them, even  
“down to our Times, who taught no such Thing  
“(as the Gnosticks did). For, if the Apostles  
“had been acquainted with any secret Mysteries  
“which they privately maintained and taught to  
“none but those who were Adepts, they would  
“surely have chosen them, before all others, for  
“that Purpose, to whom they committed the Care  
“of the very Churches themselves: For they  
“would have those to be perfect and unblame-  
“able, whom they left to succeed them; and to  
“whom they delivered up their own proper Place  
“of Magistracy,” or Government. It is plain from  
hence that the Apostles set over every Church,  
which they founded, one single Person (who in  
Irenæus’s Time was called a Bishop) as their Suc-  
cessor, in their Stead, to govern his particular  
Church, in his own Person, by the same Rules,  
and in the same Manner as they themselves were  
used to do. And this they did (as Irenæus tells  
us)

<sup>b</sup> Episc. P. 136.

<sup>i</sup> Habemus annumerare eos qui ab Apostolis instituti sunt  
Episcopi in Ecclesiis, & Successores eorum usque ad nos; qui  
nihil tale docuerunt, neque cognoverunt, quale ab his deliratur.  
Etenim

us) by delivering up to them <sup>k</sup> *their own proper Place of Magistracy* or Government in it. Now what Words are there to be found which can express, in a stronger and clearer Manner than these do, the high Dignity and divine Authority of a Bishop of Christ's Church, as we have them at this Day? This Bishop was appointed by the Apostles themselves to succeed them in that particular Station in the Church they had held before; and he was to govern it alone, without any other Person joined with him. And this was the Reason why Irenæus adds "that <sup>l</sup> their own good or bad Behaviour would be attended with exceeding good, or excessive bad Consequences to Religion." So much depended upon the Character of the Governors of Christ's Church. Now these are Marks of such extraordinary Prerogatives conferred upon this Order of Men above the common Presbyters of the Church, as, by the great Singularity of their Commission and Powers (instead of ranking as only *primi inter Pares*) do plainly denote them to be of a different and superior Order to all the rest. The intelligent Reader must now determine whether a Bishop, in the Notion Irenæus had of that Dignity, was such a one as governs our Church at this Day, or no. I need to add nothing to what Mr. Forster has said out of Tertullian. I will therefore mention only one Passage, wherein he bids the Hereticks of his Time <sup>m</sup> "declare the Series of their Bishops brought

M 4

" down.

Etenim si recondita Myſteria ſciſſent Apoſtoli, quæ ſeorsim & latenter ab reliquis perfectos docebant; his vel maxime traderent ea, quibus etiam ipsas Ecclesias committebant. Valde enim perfectos & irreprehensibiles in omnibus eos volebant esse, quos & Successores relinquebant, suum ipsorum Locum Magisterii tradentes. Iren. adv. Hær. Lib. III. Cap. 3.

<sup>k</sup> Suum ipsorum Locum Magisterii tradentes. <sup>l</sup> Quibus emendate agentibus fieret magna Utilitas, lapsis autem summa Calamitas. Ir. ubi supra.

<sup>m</sup> Evolvant Ordinem Episcoporum suorum, ita per Successiones



“ down in such a Manner by Succession from the  
 “ Beginning, that their first Bishop had one of  
 “ the Apostles, or those that conversed with the  
 “ Apostles, that appointed him, and was his im-  
 “ mediate Predecessor.” It is plain by this Word  
*Antecessorem* that Tertullian thought a Bishop and  
 an Apostle, as to the Government of the Church,  
 were one and the same Thing ; and that, agreea-  
 bly to Irenæus, they put the episcopal Power they  
 had into the Hands of such as they settled as Go-  
 vernors over the several Churches they planted.  
 But <sup>n</sup> “ Clemens it seems makes Presbyters and  
 “ Bishops the same by divine Institution.” Now  
 this cannot be true ; because he gives Bishops the  
 Title of *Ἡγούμενοι* and *Προηγούμενοι*, as has been be-  
 fore observed ; and therefore the *Επισκοποι* of Cle-  
 mens are no other than the Scripture *Επισκοποι*,  
 that is, Presbyters. But still Mr. How says there  
 is nothing in Ignatius’s Epistle to Polycarp, <sup>o</sup>  
 “ that intimates any Superiority he had over the  
 “ other Presbyters of the Church.” What then  
 does the Martyr mean when he says to Polycarp, <sup>p</sup>  
*Maintain thy Place with all Care ?* If he was placed  
 in no higher Station than the ordinary Presbyters,  
 what particular Place could belong to him more  
 than to the rest ? But if he had vested in him, as  
 really was the Case, a much superior Place and  
 Dignity above the ordinary Presbyters ; then was  
 it proper Advice given him by Ignatius, to main-  
 tain and support the Honour and Respect due to  
 his Station by his holy Life and Conversation,  
 and all other lawful Means. And that this is  
 what the holy Martyr means, appears from some  
 other Advice he gives him : <sup>q</sup> *Let nothing, says he,*  
*be*

nes ab initio, decurrentem, ut primus ille Episcopus aliquem ex  
 Apostolis, vel Apostolicis Viris, qui tamen cum Apostolis perse-  
 veraverit, habuerit Auctorem & Antecessorem. <sup>a</sup> Episc. Page  
 136. <sup>o</sup> Episc. Ibid. <sup>p</sup> Εκδικει σου τον τοπον εν παση επιμελεια.  
 Ign. ad Polyc. Sect. 1. <sup>q</sup> Μηδεν αυτη γωμης σου γινωσθαι. Ign.  
 ad Polyc. Sect. 4.

be done, without thy Knowledge and Consent. This, all, who are acquainted with Ignatius, know very well he would not have said to any Person under the Degree of a Bishop, to whom alone he allows a negative Voice. I think these two Passages plainly shew, that Polycarp had a Superiority over the Presbyters of his Church, even just as Ignatius had over his. But we are told that the Inscription of the Epistle of Clemens ' " looks more like the " Congregational Pastor, than the Diocesan Bishop." The Inscription is this : " " The Church " which sojourneth at Rome to the Church which " sojourneth at Corinth." Now let but any Man suppose there were fifty Congregations at Rome, and then think whether it be improper, in that Case, to say, *the Church which sojourneth at Rome, &c.* And I am sure he will find that it looks just as much like a Diocesan Bishop as it does a Congregational Pastor. But if we consider that ' all the Villages which were under the Jurisdiction of that City, and, of Consequence, under the Jurisdiction of that Bishop, were always included when that City or Church was spoke of ; then this Inscription will look more like a Diocesan Bishop than a Congregational Pastor. However, " " there is no Evidence, says Mr. How, that the Church of Rome " was any more than a Parish Church, capable of " personal Communion, long after him." Let us see then whether we cannot produce some Evidence to the contrary. In the first Place, Irenæus calls the Church of Rome " " the greatest, the most ancient, known to all the World, and founded by " the most glorious Apostles Peter and Paul." And this seems to confirm what is said by the Author

' Episc. P. 137.

\* Η Εκκλησία του Θεου η παροικουσα Ρώμην τη Εκκλησία του Θεου παροικουση Κορινθον.

† Παντας υπο την ποδην αγρους. Theoph. ad Autol.

² Episc. Pag. 137.

³ Iren. adv. Hær. Lib. III. Cap. 3. Maxima & antiquissima, & ab omnibus cognita, a gloriosissimis duobus Apostolis Petro & Paulo Romæ fundata & constituta Ecclesia.

enor of *Vetusti Catalogi Episcoporum Romæ*, commonly called the *Liber Pontificalis*; that, in the Time of Evaristus, there was so great a Multitude of Christians at Rome, that “<sup>c</sup> he was “ forced to divide them into several Titles or Congregations, and distribute them amongst his “ Presbyters, assigning every one his Congregation; keeping one for his own personal Care, “ and retaining at the same Time his Power of “ Government over the rest.” But Evaristus was the immediate Successor of Clemens; therefore *not long after him*. <sup>d</sup> Mr. How talks a great deal of the Uncertainty of the first Succession of the Bishops of Rome, as if that sufficiently ruined all Pretence to Apostolick Institution. But, however uncertain their History may be, we know very well, from Irenæus and Tertullian, that, wherever the Apostles planted a Church, they appointed one single Person to govern that Church in their Stead; and so at Rome. And, as to the seeming Contradictions of the Ancients one to another, if he would have looked into Bishop <sup>e</sup> Pearson’s Dissertations, he would have found all such Difficulties cleared up. This great Man has likewise shewn that Cletus and Anacletus were, both, one and the same Person; with his Name a little differently modified by different Writers; which by such, as are at all acquainted with ancient History, is known to happen frequently. But to proceed. The Subjection of the two inferior Orders, to the Bishop, had been argued from an Apostolick Canon. The whole Canon runs thus: “<sup>f</sup> Let the Presbyters “ and

<sup>c</sup> *Usque eo crevisse Fidelium Numerum ut—Titulos (hoc est Ecclesias sive Cœtus) Romæ distribuere, & Presbyteris suis dividere coactus fuerit, singulis Parte assignata, sibi vero maxima retenta, penes quem reliquorum Inspectio remansit. Lib. Pont. in Vita Evaristi.* <sup>d</sup> *Episc. P. 137.* <sup>e</sup> *Pearson. Dissert. de Successione primor. Romæ Episcoporum. Diss. 2. Cap. 1.*

<sup>f</sup> *Οι Πρεσβυτεροι η οι διακονοι ανευ γνωμας τη επισκοπη μηδεν επιτελει-  
τωσιν*



“ and Deacons do nothing without the Consent of  
 “ the Bishop : For it is he who is entrusted with  
 “ the People of the Lord ; and of him will an  
 “ Account of their Souls be required.” The  
 Reader will easily perceive that the latter Part con-  
 tains the Reason for the Injunction in the former.  
 Mr. Forster had quoted only the Injunction : But  
 Mr. How has a Mind to shew that the latter Part  
 proves the Bishop, here meant, to have been a Con-  
 gregational, and not a Diocesan, Bishop. For,  
 says he, “ Does the Diocesan consider all the  
 “ People of his Diocese, as committed to his *per-*  
 “ *sonal* Care ; that they should, each, be required  
 “ of him ?” I say yes. He may take Care of eve-  
 ry Person in his Diocese, in the Sense this Canon  
 requires him. But Mr. How has inserted a certain  
 Word in his Comment, which is no where to be  
 found in the Original ; and that is the Word *Per-*  
*sonal* ; for the Canon no where requires the Bi-  
 shop’s personal Attendance upon every Particular.  
 And this is plain from the 34th Canon : “ <sup>h</sup> We  
 “ enjoin, that the Bishop have the Power of dis-  
 “ posing of the Goods of the Church ; for, if he is  
 “ to be entrusted with the precious Souls of Men,  
 “ much more should he be empowered to dispose  
 “ of their worldly Goods ; that he may, according  
 “ to the Power committed to him, bestow them  
 “ to such as are in Need, by the Hands of the  
 “ Presbyters and Deacons.” It appears from  
 hence that the Bishop, as Trustee for the Goods of  
 the Church, was to distribute them amongst the  
 Poor ; but he was to do it by the Hands of his  
 Presbyters and Deacons. Here then was one Part  
 of

τωςαν· αὐτος γὰρ εἰν ὁ πεπιστευμένος τὸν λαὸν τῇ Κυρίῳ, καὶ τὸν ὑπὲρ  
 τῶν ψυχῶν αὐτῶν λόγοι ἀπαριθμησόμενος. Can. Apost. 32. Ed.  
 Pat. Ap. per Le Clerk. § Episc. P. 141. <sup>h</sup> Προσάσσειν  
 τὸν ἐπίσκοπον ἐξουσίαν ἔχειν τῶν τῆς ἐκκλησίας πραγμάτων. Εἰ γὰρ τὰς  
 τιμίας τῶν ἀνθρώπων ψυχὰς αὐτῷ πιστευτοῖ, πολλῶν ἀν. διοι. περὶ τῶν  
 χρημάτων ἐπέλλεσθαι· ὥστε κατὰ τὴν αὐτὴ ἐξουσίαν πάντα διακρίσθαι  
 τοῖς διοικοῦσι διὰ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων καὶ διακόνων,

of his Office, which the Canon expressly says he should do by the Hands of his Presbyters and Deacons. But it may perhaps be urged that the Souls of Men require the immediate and personal Care of the Bishop. Let us then see what another Canon says upon this Point. The 29th Canon, speaking of a Bishop, who refuses the Trust committed to him, says afterwards: “<sup>1</sup> But if he goes (i. e. to undertake it as his Trust) and be not received; not through his own Will, but through the ill Will of the People; he shall be their Bishop. But the Clergy of that City shall be excommunicated; because they did not better instruct such a disobedient People.” It appears from hence, that, so early as the Time this Canon was made, i. e. some Time in the second Century, the People were under the immediate Care and Instruction of the inferior Clergy, the Presbyters and Deacons. The preceding Bishop is not blamed by this Canon, because, although it was a Bishop’s Duty, among other Things, to preach, as well as others, yet that was at what Times, and in what Places of his Diocese he should think fit. It was incumbent upon him to see that his inferior Clergy did their Duty, and to punish and reward them as should be found necessary. The Bishop then, as this Canon declares, used to act in his Care for the Souls, as well as Bodies of Men, by Means of his Substitutes, the Presbyters and Deacons; who had the immediate Care of the Souls of the People committed to them under the Inspection of the Bishop. But it seems the “<sup>k</sup> Injunction laid upon them (i. e. the Clergy) to do nothing, without his Privy and Consent, is enforced only by the Consideration of the Bishop’s personal Ministry  
“ with

<sup>1</sup> Εἰ δὲ ἀπειθῇ μὴ διχθῆναι, ὁ παρὰ τὴν αὐτὴν γνῶμην, ἀλλὰ παρὰ τὴν τῶ λαοῦ μοχθηρίαν· αὐτὸς μὲν ἐστὶν ἐπίσκοπος, ὁ δὲ κληρὸς τῆς πόλεως ἀφορίζεται, ὅτι τοιοῦτον λαὸν ἀνυπότακτον παιδεύεται ὡς ἔγνωτο. Can. Apost. 29.    <sup>k</sup> Episc. P. 141.

“ with them, in the same Congregation.” As if a Magistrate could not put the Laws in Execution against evil Doers, without being present himself at the Commission of every Offence. And this Word *αυτου* has no Relation at all to the Bishop’s being actually present; but to his Authority and Injunctions only, forbidding every Person to administer in any sacred Office, separately, or in Opposition to him, not having any Commission or Authority from him so to do. And this is plain from what we find in the 27th Canon, viz.

“ Let the Bishops of every Province acknow-  
 “ ledge him who is the Chief among them, and  
 “ esteem him as their Head, and do nothing of  
 “ great Moment without his Concurrence.” Now I would ask our Author himself whether, even upon the Supposition that these were all Presbyter Bishops; whether this Chief amongst them could possibly be present, in their several Congregations, at every Thing they did, to see they did nothing but what he approved of: But, nevertheless, the Canon says they were to do nothing without his Concurrence. They and their Chief might meet together and consult about what was to be done, and determine upon it in Presence of their Chief; but the Execution of it must be, severally, by each apart in his particular Congregation; and yet they were to do nothing without his Approbation. This shews that *αυτου* has no Respect at all to the actual Presence of the Bishop with his Clergy, whilst they are doing their Duty; but to his Power and Authority, whereby he may prohibit any one from performing any sacred Office, without having first obtained a Commission from him so to do. He then that does any Thing *αυτου*, i. e. without his Bishop,

<sup>1</sup> Τῶς Ἐπισκοπῶς καὶ αὐτοὶ ἀδελφοὶ ἔχει τοὺς ἐν αὐτοῖς πρεσβυτέρους, καὶ ἡγουμένους αὐτοὺς ὡς κεφαλὴν, καὶ μὴδὲν τι πράττειν χωρὶς αὐτοῦ τε καὶ ὁμοῦ γνώμης. Can. Apost. 27.



Bishop, is understood to be one that pretends to act independently, or in Opposition to, or in Separation from his Bishop; As, I presume, must now fully appear. But, to prove farther that a Bishop at that Time was no other than a Congregational Bishop, our Author appeals to another Canon, which enjoins the Bishop not to leave his Diocese without a reasonable Cause. <sup>m</sup> No, says Mr. How, <sup>n</sup> the Canon means his Parish, i. e. his Congregation; for the Word in the Original is Παροικια; and therefore the Bishop was confined to a Parish in the modern Sense of that Word. Now, in the first Place, the Word Παροικια has, in its natural Signification, no Relation at all to what we now call a Parish. It is derived from Παροικος, which signifies a Stranger or Foreigner, living, for a While, in a Place at a Distance from his settled Habitation, <sup>o</sup> as the Reader may see sufficiently proved in Suicer. From hence came Παροικια to signify a Body of Christians who called themselves Παροικοι, i. e. Strangers, or Foreigners, such as had no abiding City in this World, but united under one Head, whether they lived at one, or more Miles Distance from each other, or whatever Number of Churches, or Places of divine Worship, they had Occasion for. And this is demonstrably the Case from the 27th Canon, where, among other Things, it enjoins the Bishop “<sup>p</sup> to “ do no other Business than what concerns his “ own Παροικια, or Diocese; and those Towns, or “ Countries, that lie within his own Jurisdiction.” From whence I conclude that the Composers of these Canons understood, by Παροικια, a Tract of Country, containing many Towns and Villages; and, consequently, many Congregations, besides those

<sup>m</sup> Episc. Pag. 141.      <sup>n</sup> Can. Apost. 11.      <sup>o</sup> Suicer ad Verb. Παροικος.      <sup>p</sup> Εκείνα δε μόνα εκάστον, οσα τη αὐτῇ παροικίᾳ ἐπιβάλλει, καὶ ταῖς ὑπὸ αὐτὴν χωραῖς.

those of the Bishop's principal Place of Residence. In short, no other than what we now do call, and for many hundred Years has been called, a Diocese; wherein the Bishop has been always used to preach at what Times and Places he thought proper. And, if he finds his Endeavours have not the desired Success, he may be induced to think sometimes that he might be able to do more Good in another Diocese than that wherein he is at present settled. And yet the ordinary Teaching the People be performed by the inferior Clergy, as we see, that in Fact it was. But, now we are upon the Word *Παροικια*, our Author must have a Fling at Mr. Slater. He tells us "the Whole of his "laboured Performance is little more than an "Endeavour to force another Construction upon "the Enquirer's Authorities, without scarcely "ever attempting to produce any positive Evidence of a different Constitution." Now, whatever the Case may be between the Enquirer and Mr. Slater; if Mr. Slater has shewn that the Enquirer's Quotations are either to no Purpose, or else curtailed and mangled, in order to serve his Purpose, when otherwise they would prove against them; I think he has fully confuted the Enquirer. And I humbly conceive he has done so to the Satisfaction of all those who are qualified to be Judges in the Case, and are not biassed by Prejudice. But Mr. How will have the Word *Παροικια* to signify a Parish, because he has found in Scapula, that it is used, by Heathen Authors, \* for an Assembly or Convention of Neighbours, a religious Association. But, as to the ecclesiastical Use of that Word, I shall abide by Suicer's Opinion, who, I think, knew more of that Matter than Scapula, or perhaps than his Master Robert Stephens himself; because he had made it his particular

\* Episc. Pag. 143.

\* Ib. Pag. 144.

ricular Study. Thus then Suicer: “ \* Παροιμία,  
 “ says he, at that Time (that is, before the Word Δι-  
 “ οικήσις came into Use) was put by the Greek Wri-  
 “ ters to signify the Church of a whole City, which  
 “ obeyed a single Bishop, and comprehended the  
 “ whole Number of Christians residing in that  
 “ City,—disperfed or divided into many parti-  
 “ cular Congregations.” And farther he says  
 that “ Παροιμία means the same Thing with  
 “ the Greeks as the Diocefe of a Bishop.” Then,  
 as to the Verb Παροικεω, it had been urged  
 that “ St. Luke uses it to signify only the tempo-  
 rary Residence of a Stranger. In Reply to which  
 Mr. How asks, “ w How shall we render, agree-  
 “ ably with that Sense, Εκκλησία του Θεου παροικουσα  
 “ Ρωμην τη—παροικουση Κορινθον. Or εκκλησία η  
 “ παροικουσα Σμυρναν? Shall it be the Church of  
 “ God confifting of Strangers in Rome?” And  
 why not? But, if that does not please him, I will  
 render it in fewer Words, thus: The Church of  
 God which *sojourns* at Rome to the Church which  
*sojourns* at Corinth; or to the Church which *so-*  
*journs* at Smyrna. For the holy Martyr did not  
 use the Word παροικουση because of those Christians  
 living near together, but because he understood  
 them to be Sojourners only, who resided there for  
 a Time, till they should remove to their fixed Ha-  
 bitation in Heaven; as \* they had no continuing  
 City in this World: But †, as Abraham in the  
 Land of Promise, so the Christians *sojourn* in this  
 World, as in a strange Country; looking for a  
 City which hath Foundations, whose Builder and  
 Maker is God. And of this Opinion is the learn-  
 ed

\* Παροιμία tunc apud Græcos Ecclesia fuit Civitatis unius, quæ  
 uni Episcopo parebat, & universam Plebem fidelium in illa Civitate  
 consistentium comprehendebat—in plures dispersitam minores  
 Conventus.

† Apud Græcos Παροιμία idem est cum Dio-  
 cesi Episcopi. Suicer ibid.

“ Episc. P. 145.

\* Heb. xiii. 14.

“ Orig. Drau. P. 31, 32.

† Ib. xi. 9, 10.



ed Valeſius<sup>a</sup>. “ Παροιχια, ſays he, ſignifies a  
 “ Church in the Chriſtian Writers, and in a great  
 “ Number of Places in Eusebius. And this Sig-  
 “ nification of the Word is derived from the No-  
 “ tion that the Church is only a Stranger and  
 “ Sojourner in this World; but that its own pro-  
 “ per Country and City is in Heaven.” And for  
 this he quotes theſe very Places. A little after he  
 ſays<sup>b</sup>, “ I would render the Word (Παροιχιας) Ci-  
 “ ties, or Sees; ſince Eusebius meant ſuch as the  
 “ Church of Rome, Alexandria, and the like.”  
 We ſee then, that the Word Παροιχια was by the  
 ancient Greeks uſed for a Dioceſe, and not a Pa-  
 riſh; and that Chriſtians were called Παροιχοι, not  
 from living nearly together, but from their con-  
 ceiving of themſelves as only Strangers or Foreign-  
 ers; as having no abiding City in this World.  
 The contrary to this is by many ſuppoſed to be  
 underſtood by the Word Κατοιχειν, i. e. to dwell  
 in a ſettled and fixed Habitation, without any De-  
 ſire or Intention to remove. But Mr. How ſays<sup>b</sup>,  
 “ it is certain that St. Luke uſes the Word Κατοι-  
 “ χειν, to expreſs the temporary Reſidence of  
 “ Strangers, too (i. e. as well as Παροιχειν):<sup>c</sup> And  
 “ there were dwelling at Jeruſalem (κατοικουντες,  
 “ ſojourning Jews) devout Men from every Na-  
 “ tion under Heaven; and ſome of theſe are ſaid  
 “ to be (οι κατοικουντες την Μεſοποταμιαν) Dwellers  
 “ in Meſopotamia. But they could not be ſtated  
 “ Inhabitants of both Places at once; and there-  
 “ fore, in one of the Inſtances, the Word muſt be  
 N “ uſed

<sup>a</sup> Παροιχια quidem ſignificat Eccleſiam apud Chriſtianos Scrip-  
 tores, & nominatim apud Eusebium noſtrum non uno in Loc.  
 Cujus ſignificationis Origo ex eo manare mihi videtur, quod Ec-  
 cleſia in Terris duntaxat inquilina ſit & παροιχος; ejus autem Pa-  
 tria & Municipatus in Cælo ſit.

<sup>a</sup> Ego Civitates aut  
 ſedes malim vertere;—intelligit enim Eusebius Eccleſiam Roma-  
 nam, Alexandrinam, &c. Valeſ. Not. 2. P. 1. Euf. Hiſt. Eccl.  
 Ed. Reading. <sup>b</sup> Epif. P. 145. <sup>c</sup> Acts ii. 5—12.

“used only for a temporary Residence.” Now if, in either of these Instances, the Word κατοικέω means Residing for a Time only, and not as in a fixed and settled Habitation; I am bold to say it is the only Place in the whole New Testament where it is to be so understood. But, if we take away a Word or two which Mr. How has inserted by Way of Explication, we shall scarce find his Meaning to be that of the sacred Writers. In the former Part of his Quotation he renders κατοικούντες *sojourning*, which I apprehend is not the right Sense of that Word; because it is Fact that the Jews increased to such a Degree as forced them to send out Colonies of Jews into all Parts of the World: And of these great Numbers, especially such as were religiously inclined, though born, and dwelling, for many Years, in foreign Countries<sup>a</sup>, came at last and settled at Jerusalem; and there had their fixed Habitation. These Jews then were not Sojourners, but settled Inhabitants of Jerusalem. And let not the Reader be carried away with the Notion of κατοικούντες being a Participle of the Present Tense, and therefore requiring to be understood of Persons being Dwellers at that very Time: No. For Participles are in the Eastern Languages often used as Adjectives, without any Regard at all, either to the Present or Præter Tense; as they who are the least acquainted with those Languages very well know. This Word therefore signifies those who had beforetime dwelt in foreign Nations; and afterward left their former Habitations, and settled at Jerusalem; agreeably to what St. Luke says, viz. “That there were dwelling at Jerusalem Jews, devout Men out of every Nation under Heaven.” For, if they had

<sup>a</sup> In his *Coloniis* nati *Judæi* non pauci, præsertim religiosi, sedes Hierosolymis fixas habebant: Unde S. Luca κατοικούντες. Pearl. Lect. in Acta Apost. P. 32.

<sup>a</sup> Acta ii. 5.





Not ye that are come up to this Feast, but ye that are Dwellers. And these same Persons, that before were amazed, upon hearing St. Peter's Sermon, were "pricked to their Heart, and said unto Peter what shall we do?" And, upon St. Peter's resolving their Doubts, St. Luke tells us, that "the same Day there were added unto them about three thousand Souls. But these Converts, instead of going Home after the Feast, are said to have "continued stedfastly in the Apostles Doctrine, &c." And that "all who believed were together." And "that they continued daily with one Accord in the Temple." Instead then of going Home to any Distance, they did not stir a Foot out of Jerusalem. The Consequence of all this is, that these first Converts were not People that came up to the Feast, but such as were fixed Dwellers, at that Time, at Jerusalem. Mr. How is forced to acknowledge, "there were, afterwards, several Thousands of believing Jews at Jerusalem, all zealous of the Law: But this was also at the Feast of Pentecost." When he supposes St. Paul was there. If he was there at that Time, there could not want Converts in such a populous City as Jerusalem then was, without the Help of such as might come to the Feast. But what if St. Paul did not arrive at Jerusalem till after the Feast of Pentecost, notwithstanding the Desire he had of being present at it? Mr. Maurice seems to me to have pretty plainly made out that it was impossible, at least very improbable, that he should get thither so soon. And the very learned Bishop of Chester is of the same Opinion. It is certain there is no Mention of that Feast, or of any Thing relating to

<sup>a</sup> Acts v. 37.      <sup>\*</sup> Ib. v. 41.      <sup>p</sup> Ib. v. 42.      <sup>q</sup> Ib. v. 44.      <sup>r</sup> Ib. v. 46.      <sup>s</sup> Episc. P. 146.      <sup>t</sup> Maur. Def. of Dioc. Episc. P. 33-36.      <sup>u</sup> Annal. Paul. P. 16.

to it, in the Acts, after St. Paul arrived at Jerusalem: But, if he had got thither at the Time of the Feast, I think it very probable, that we should have found some Notices or other of his having succeeded in the earnest Desire he had of being present at that Feast. On the contrary, there is not a Word about it. If then the Apostle was not at Jerusalem at the Feast of Pentecost, Mr. How's Reasoning falls to the Ground. Especially when it appears plainly from this History, that there was no Occasion for any Feast, to supply the Church with three Times three thousand Converts. For soon after St. Peter converted five thousand; and that upon no Feast-day whatever. Neither do we read of any particular great Accession of Profelytes to the Christian Faith; on any of the three Feasts, except on this Feast of Pentecost, of three thousand Souls. But, after the Conversion of the five thousand, “<sup>w</sup> Believers were “ the more added to the Church, Multitudes “ both of Men and Women.” And afterwards “<sup>x</sup> the Word of God increased, and the Number “ of the Disciples multiplied in Jerusalem greatly; and a great Company of the Priests were “ obedient to the Faith.” Now these Accessions are no-where said to consist of foreign Jews, or such as came to Jerusalem upon solemn Times; but these Multitudes were converted, more or less, daily: And therefore cannot be supposed to have had many amongst them, besides those who were Dwellers at Jerusalem. But, to prove how few the Believers were, notwithstanding eight thousand were converted by two Sermons only of St. Peter's, besides many others, who were daily brought over to the Christian Faith, as we have seen; Mr. How would fain persuade us, that “<sup>y</sup> the Believers at “ Jerusalem, even the whole Church, are frequently

<sup>w</sup> Acts v. 14.

<sup>x</sup> Ib. vi. 7.

<sup>y</sup> Episc. P. 146.

“quently represented as together in one Place.” For this he quotes Acts iv. 31. v. 12. xv. 22. Let us then examine how far these Texts will go towards supporting his Position. When Peter and John had converted five thousand, they were apprehended by the Jews; and, after their Dismission, we read <sup>a</sup> they went to their own Company, and made their Report. Now the Question is, Who made up this Company? They could not be the whole eight thousand, because St. Luke says the Apostles returned *προς τους ιδίους*, *to their own Company*, which he distinguishes from the *το πλθος των πιστευσαντων*. *The Multitude of them that believed*, mentioned in the 32d Verse. It must then consist of those who <sup>a</sup> generally consorted with the Apostles, and were of their Acquaintance <sup>b</sup>. It could not be all the Christians, who, being eight thousand, were not to be contained all in one House; but it was the hundred-and-twenty mentioned Chap. i. 15. And, being in the same House with the Apostles, were their own Company to whom they went; and upon all of them the Holy Ghost then fell, and enabled them to preach the Word of God with Boldness. The next Passage is Acts v. 12. where the Scripture says, that <sup>c</sup> *they were all with one Accord in Solomon’s Porch*. Mr. How will have it that these *All* were the whole Church. Now it is certain that the Courts of the Temple would contain more than eight thousand; but that Solomon’s Porch would hold so many may not be very easily admitted. But, be that as it will, let us consider the Context. From the 33d Verse of the fourth Chapter, to the End of this, the sacred Writer records what happened to the Apostles when all together; as appears from verse 29, of this Chapter; where an Answer is given to the San-

<sup>a</sup> Acts iv. 23.

<sup>b</sup> See Ham. on Acts iv. 24.

<sup>c</sup> See

Whitby on Acts iv. 31.

<sup>c</sup> Acts v. 12.



Sanhedrim by Peter and the other Apostles: Upon the Apostles passing Sentence of Death upon Ananias and Sapphira, we read that great Fear came upon all the Church, and upon as many as heard these Things. That is, all the Believers were struck with a great Reverence and awful Regard for the Apostles, when they had done these mighty Works. In the next Verse, St. Luke tells us, that by the Hands of the Apostles were many Signs and Wonders wrought among the People. And they were all with one Accord in Solomon's Porch: Not all the People; but all the Apostles solemnly met together to preach, &c. in Solomon's Porch. And *of the rest durst no Man join himself to them*, i. e. none other of the Believers, or Christians (called the Church in V. 11.) durst consort with the Twelve Apostles thro' that high Degree of Reverence and awful Respect which these late Acts had created in the Believers. But the People that saw and heard what was done, magnified them. So Dr. Hammond paraphrases this Place. And I believe it is the true Interpretation of it: For it is certain, that this great Fear, which came upon all those who saw and heard of what was done, did not hinder any Body from joining themselves to the Apostles in such a Way as to become Converts to their Faith and Religion: For we are told in the <sup>b</sup> next Verse, that Believers were the more added to the Lord, Multitudes both of Men and Women. These Miracles, which created such Reverence and godly Fear towards the Apostles, in the Minds of all the Christians, were a Means of converting Multitudes. St. Luke therefore, by these Words *the rest*, means all the Church, upon whom great Fear came. And they expressed that Fear by not dar-

N 4

ing

<sup>a</sup> Acts v. 13.<sup>b</sup> Ib. Verse 14.

ing to : associate themselves, or consort familiarly with the Apostles ; who were endued with such mighty Power from on high : As Men usually behave to those who are far exalted above them in high Stations and Power. The Word *All* therefore, in the 12th Verse, means Nobody else besides the Persons of the 12 Apostles ; and not the whole Church ; of whom no Man durst join himself to them. Mr. How's last Proof is from Acts xv. 22. Where we read, that it pleased the Apostles and Elders *with the whole Church*, to send chosen Men of their Company to Antioch. And this Phrase, *the whole Church*, according to him, must mean, that the whole Number of Christians, which, long before, consisted of Multitudes over and above the eight thousand, were, in the literal Sense of these Words, all present in the Room where this Synod was held. And does not the Absurdity of this Supposition stare one in the Face ? And, to use Mr. Slater's Words, <sup>c</sup> does not this singular Construction, of such obvious and familiar Forms of Speech as these, bear hard upon the common Sense and Language of Mankind ? Can no public Act of civil Justice, or solemn Ministration in the Church, amongst us, be said to pass in the Face of the Country, before all the People, openly, and in the Sight of all Men ; nay, in the Face of the whole World, unless the Matter of Fact will answer to the very Letter of the Phrase ? Are not all public or solemn Acts of Church or State (as to Discipline or Government) familiarly distinguished from any others, by such a Latitude of Expression as this ? And no otherwise taken by any Man, than that a general Liberty is given to all who either can, or will, or are concerned to be present at them ; to judge, or bear Witness of the

Regu-

<sup>c</sup> That this is the true Sense of the Word *κολλησθαι*, see Acts viii. 29, Chap. ix. 26, Chap. x. 28. <sup>d</sup> Orig. Dra P. 70—72.

Regularity and Justice of what is done? And so in our Courts of Justice, where every Body, that will or can, may be present; we say that Justice is administered in public, before the Face of the whole World: Although but few, in Comparison, can get into the Court where the Judges sit. But to consider the sacred Writings: What more familiar Phrase do we meet with in the Books of Moses during all the Time of his Government, than that \* Moses himself spake to all the Congregation of Israel whatsoever the Lord commanded him? Nay, even in the Ears of all the Congregation of Israel, he is said to † speak the Words of that Song which he left for a Testimony against them. But in what Sense can we conceive he himself should be said to speak in the hearing of so numerous a Host, as the Children of Israel then were? It is certain he could not speak so as to be heard and understood by the hundreth Part of them. But he himself has given us a Key, whereby to understand such Phrases as these. \* “Gather me, says he, the † Elders of the Tribes, and the Officers, that I may † speak these Words in their Ears, and call Heaven † and Earth to record against them.” Hence it plainly appears, that whatever Moses spake in such a Manner and in such an Audience, as was sufficient to convey his Words and Precepts to all the Tribes of Israel, though not immediately from his own Lips; he thought it no improper Expression, when he related as spoken to the whole Congregation of Israel. And, in like Manner, as this Decree of the Apostles and Elders was made in the Presence of as many of the Church as were inclined to be there, or that the Place, where the Synod was held, would contain; the sacred Writer very properly related the Matter as transacted in the

Exod. xxxv. 1, 4. Deut. v. 1, Ch. xxix. 2, &c. † Ib. xxxi. 30. \* Ib. xxxi. 28.



the Presence of the whole Church. But to prove the Number of Christians to be very small, when they fled out of Jerusalem, we are told that <sup>a</sup> "they retired to Pella, an obscure Village, which " yet contained them all." And, in Support of this, he quotes Dr. Whitgift. Now I never had that great and learned Archbishop's Book in my Possession; so can say nothing to that. But, if Mr. How had consulted <sup>1</sup> Reland's Account of the Holy Land, he might have found that Pella was called a City by heathen Authors, before our Saviour's Time. Eusebius says, that the Christians (in Jerusalem) <sup>b</sup> were ordered to go and dwell in a certain City of Peræa, called Pella. <sup>c</sup> Epiphanius calls it a City in more than one Place. And <sup>d</sup> " St. Jerome says, that Jabesh Gilead was " situated on the other Side Jordan; and was, in " his Time, a very large Village, distant six " Miles from the City Pella." The Reader will hereby see how unlucky Mr. How is in his Account of Places; and particularly of this, which is always called a City; and is so far from being an obscure Village, that St. Jerome plainly distinguishes it from a very large Village, pergrandis Villa, as being a City. But these Christians it seems were <sup>e</sup> " all contained in this City, together " with its other Inhabitants." The Reader will observe that this is said without any Proof at all, except we allow a Quotation from Archbishop Whitgift, who, if he does call Pella a little Town, he must certainly have forgot what St. Jerome, Eusebius,

<sup>a</sup> Episc. P. 146.

<sup>1</sup> Reland. Palest. Vol. II, P. 924. See also Cellar. Geogr. Vol. II, P. 393; Ed. Quarto.

<sup>b</sup> τῆς Περαιᾶς πόλιν οὕτως καλεῖσθαι; Πέλλα αὐτὴν ὀνομαζομένη.

Euf. Hist. Eccl. Lib. III, Cap. 5. P. 93. Ed. Re.

<sup>c</sup> Epiph. de Mens. & Pond. P. 171. Ed. Petav. V. 2.

<sup>d</sup> Est autem Jabis trans Jordanem, nunc Villa pergrandis, a Civitate Pella sex Millibus distans. Hier. Vol. I, de Locis Hebr. Page

178. Ed. 1684.

<sup>e</sup> Episc. P. 146.

Eusebius, Epiphanius, and half a Score more Authors say of it. As to Eusebius, he speaks in general Terms only; and, as ° Valesius observes, from Tradition; for he does not name his Author. Neither does he mention in particular that the Christians did every one of them go to inhabit that very City. And therefore we can understand no more by Eusebius, than that they were ordered to go to Pella; which I suppose they did; and such as could not find Room there, dwelt in the Towns of Peræa, wherein the City of Pella was situated. And, that this is the true Interpretation of Eusebius Epiphanius, tells us, when he says, that † all the Christians that came from Jerusalem, lived (at the Time when the Heresy of the Ebionites first arose) in Peræa, and the greatest Part of them in a City of Decapolis, called Pella. So that, in the first Place, Pella was a City, and not an obscure Village; and, secondly, it is not necessary to understand Eusebius, as if he meant that every individual Christian went and actually inhabited within the City Pella itself. I have now, as far as I know, considered every Thing material, which Mr. How has alledged against the divine Right of Diocesan Episcopacy: The Remainder of his Book being partly Recapitulation, and partly Abuse, and partly containing other Matters; which have but little Relation to the Subject I proposed to confine myself to. Especially as he declares that they must stand or fall with the Question about the divine Right of Episcopacy. However, if any Body has a Mind to see those novel Opinions of his effectually confuted, he will not be deceived in his Expectation, if he will but take the Pains to consult ‡ Bishop Hoadley's Reason-

° See Vales Not. in Loc.    † Παντες οι εις Χριστον πιστευουσαι, την Περαιαν κατ' εκεινο καιρου κατοικησαν το πλεον εν Πελλα της δεκαπολεως.  
‡ Reasonableness of Conformity, Page 341.

Reasonableness of Conformity. Where he will find the whole Controversy between the Dissenters and us discussed, and every Argument, or Shadow of an Argument, brought by Mr. Calamy, fully and clearly answered; insomuch, that whoever will but peruse that excellent Book a little carefully, I can hardly suppose could continue to dissent from the Church of England, if not altogether biassed by a more than ordinary Prejudice. The Reader therefore will, I hope, excuse me, if I lay before him this learned Writer's Sentiments upon this Question, and a few of the many Reasons which created in him those Sentiments. His Lordship thought, as I should imagine, every one who understands Ignatius's Epistles, and believes them to be genuine, must think that the least, which can follow from the Expressions we there meet with, is that Episcopacy (i. e. Diocesan Episcopacy) was settled in his Days, and was at a great Height; when neither worldly Advantage could make it so, nor was there Time from the Apostles Deaths for a gradual Increase to such a Pitch: For he lived in the Apostles Days; and died a Martyr for Christianity; and was always highly esteemed in the Church. And it is the most reasonable Thing in the World to suppose that he could not speak of Episcopacy as he does, had he known it to have been only the Agreement of Presbyters among themselves; had he known it to have been an Alteration in the Church from that in which the Apostles left it. And the more highly he magnifies it, still the greater Argument it is that he

<sup>a</sup> No Man, says Bishop Lloyd, that considers the Antiquity of that Father, who died within ten Years after St. John the Apostle, can doubt whether his Kind of Episcopacy were the Government that the Apostles left in his Church: Neither can any Man, that weighs the Words, doubt whether, in his Judgment that used them, all the Priests of every Diocese were subject to their own Bishop. Lloyd on Gov of Brit. Ch. P. 73, 74.



he knew it to be settled by the Apostles, in the Churches of Christ; and that it was their Will it should be retained and esteemed. It is impossible to speak of it as he doth, if he knew it, and all the Church then knew it, to be a voluntary prudential Compact amongst the Presbyters. For what could induce him to do it? Or what Influence could his high Words have upon those who knew, as well as himself, that it was just then agreed upon; and had no higher an Original than the Consent of Presbyters? Therefore Episcopacy could not be a novel Constitution, contrived just then by the Presbyters. \* A few Pages afterwards the Bishop goes on to consider the Opinion of some very learned Men in the Opposition. Which Opinion was that the Apostles left the Churches under the joint Government of Presbyters; but that they did all, after their Deaths, voluntarily consent and agree to alter this Form of Government, and to establish fixed Bishops for the Government of the Churches, and of the Presbyters belonging to them. And some, says the Bishop, have attempted to conjecture about what Time this great Change was made; viz. about forty Years after the Death of the Apostles. But I desire, says the Bishop, the following Particulars may be duly weighed. First, It may reasonably be expected that for the Proof of a Change so great, and so universal, some plain and evident Testimonies of ancient Writers, who lived at the very Time when this Change is supposed to be made, should be produced. And ~~that~~ we should not, in so notorious a Matter of Fact, be put off either with mere Conjectures drawn by modern Authors from obscure Passages of some of the Ancients; or with the Affirmation of those who were not capable Witnesses in this Point; or with such Reasoning

soning as cannot prove the Matter here affirmed. It is incredible that so great and remarkable a Change should be brought about without being known to the Persons of that Age in which it was made: And it is as incredible that none of them should ever expressly give any Account of such a Matter of Fact. I appeal to the Persons themselves who, in these modern Times, speak as confidently of this Change, as if they themselves had been concerned in the making of it, whether they can instance in any one so material and notorious a Matter of Fact as this, relating to the State of the primitive Church, which they themselves believe without the Testimony, I say, the plain and express Testimony of good and competent Witnesses. It is a Change in the Church as considerable, according to themselves, as a Change in the State from a mere Republick. And is it probable in the least Degree, that such a Matter should pass without the express Notice of any Writers in the Age in which it came to pass? Though they must necessarily be supposed to be concerned to justify it to the World, and to set forth the great Reasons for such an Alteration. Is it probable that no Writer of the following Age should fix the Time, or give an express Account of it? Is it probable that the ecclesiastical Historians afterwards, whose professed Business it was to relate such Matters of Fact, and who do actually give very prolix Accounts of much smaller Affairs, should give no Account, and take no Notice of so remarkable a Thing, as a Change which, if it had been, must certainly have alarmed the whole Christian World? Again, it is a Change, according to this Hypothesis, of an apostolick Institution concerning the Government of the Church: A Thing, which, in the smallest Points, raised the greatest Jealousies and Combuſtions amongst the primitive Christians.

And

And is it possible that it should silently pass, and without any Person's bearing Witness against it? It is a Change which the adverse Party most certainly would for ever have objected to the Orthodox, in all their Disputes; and, by objecting it, might have hoped to have drawn more People to their Side than by any one Thing imaginable. And is it probable, even in the lowest Degree of Probability, that such a Change of the Apostles Institution should not once be found to be objected by any Heretick, or any Person whatsoever, against the Orthodox? Let those believe all this who are willing to believe every Thing which seems to make for their own Cause. As for all others, I think they cannot avoid inquiring after the following Manner: A Change of an apostolical Institution, relating to the Government of the Church, is a Matter of Fact, very remarkable, and of great Importance; such a one as must have been known and very much spoken of by the primitive Church; as must have been objected against the Orthodox by all their Adversaries; and as must have been particularly recorded, and accounted for, by the Writers of the Age in which it was made, and by the professed Historians of the following Ages. But we find no Testimony of any such Change made after the Apostles Days; no Notice of any Contest, or Disturbance in the Church on any such Account; though we do upon much less; and no Objection concerning any such Change, alledged by any of the primitive Writers against their Adversaries, or by any of the first Hereticks against the Orthodox: And therefore cannot but conclude that there was no such Change made in the State of the Church; not being able to think that so considerable a Matter of Fact would have been left to the Discovery of the Moderns; or that the Belief of it can be rationally built upon their Con-



Conjectures. Secondly, There being no express Testimony of competent Witnesses, in any Age of the Church, concerning such a Change made after the Days of the Apostles ; it may with Security be argued from the Improbability of the Thing itself, that there could be none. Let any one but consider the Regards of the first Christians towards Things of the smallest Importance, which they imagined to be of apostolical Institution ; that they proceeded so far as to excommunicate one another for the Sake of a supposed Neglect in so insignificant a Matter as a Time for the Observation of Easter. Nay, that they were ready to die rather than voluntarily, or designedly, to depart from any Thing Apostolical ; and then judge whether any Considerations could induce either Presbyters, or People, to carry forward and acquiesce in such a material Alteration ; or ever to believe that the Form of Government, in which the Apostles left the Churches, was not as good and as capable of preventing all Things evil amongst Christians, as any other that could possibly be thought of by any in After-ages. I grant that many Matters of small Importance, which might plead apostolical Custom, or Prescription, might be dropped and disused in After-ages : But that the almost immediate Successors of the Apostles should professedly meet to alter what they knew to be the Institution of the Apostles, in such a Matter as the Government of the Church, is incredible. Again, let any one consider the Account and Reasons of this Change, given by St. Jerome, the first Author who undertakes to give any Reason for it, and then judge whether this Change could be made at the Time fixed by those who argue, upon his Authority, in Favour of Presbyterian Government in the Church, or at any Time after the Apostles. St. Jerome says, as a Ground and Reason

Reason of this Change, that the Laity had multiplied Divisions amongst themselves, by calling themselves the Disciples of particular Presbyters (to be sure of those who baptised them) rather than of Christ; and that the Presbyters were so fond of this, that every one of them esteemed those Persons, whom they had baptised, to be their own Disciples; in such a Sense, to be sure, as to make too little Account of their common Master Christ: And that upon this Occasion it was decreed all over the Christian World, that Episcopacy should be brought into the Churches. The Conclusion, drawn from this by the Moderns, is that, about forty Years after the Apostles, the Presbyters of all Churches consented together in the fixing of single Persons in a Superiority over themselves; and that the Laity universally acquiesced in this great Alteration, for the remedying the aforesaid Evils. Which is as much as to say, that the Presbyters were universally extremely fond of making Disciples to themselves rather than to Christ; and the Laity, of calling themselves by the Names of those who had baptised them: That the Presbyters, whilst they were thus fond of raising their own Names, met together in order to remedy this which they themselves were fond of; and did unanimously agree upon a Method to remedy it; and that the Laity, whilst they were thus addicted to particular Presbyters, did, quietly and without any Opposition, acquiesce in what was prescribed for the remedying an Evil which they did not desire should be remedied. A Matter too absurd, one would think, to be believed by any Thing of human Nature. I grant that a Majority of Presbyters might agree to rectify the Mis-carriages, and to put an End to the Projects, of a smaller Number. But this Supposition is not agreeable to the forementioned Account of this

Matter; which makes the Agreement universal. And then, again, it is to be considered that this lesser Number cannot be supposed to have quietly, and without Reluctance, acquiesced in a Determination of those who had no proper Authority over them, by which they were not only prevented from prosecuting their own Designs, but also (according to modern Authors) restrained from the Exercise of Powers, in the Possession of which (according to the present Hypothesis) they were left by the Apostles themselves; nay, to the careful and conscientious Exercise of which they are animated and commanded to attend in the apostolical Writings. So likewise it may be supposed, that some of the best of the Laity might acquiesce in a Determination, by which the dividing Tempers of others might be restrained and curbed. But it is not supposable that these others should, without the least Opposition, agree to the putting a Stop to what themselves were fond of. Especially when there lay, before their Eyes, so visible a Plea against the Method by which this was to be done, viz. that it was a Deviation from the Institution of the Apostles: A Plea sufficient to have dashed the most useful Determinations at that Time; and the rather, because the Truth of it could not be denied. Never was any Thing known in History like this; that such a Change should be made by Men against their own Designs; or acquiesced in by Multitudes, both of Presbyters and Laicks, without making one Objection, when the fairest, and most unanswerable Plea in the World, lay against it. Never, I say, was any Matter of Fact, parallel to this, known in History, unless it be that there are many Persons of later Ages, who can greedily believe such an improbable Conjecture as certain Truth, without one competent express Testimony to support it. Let us put any  
of



of these Persons themselves into the Place of the primitive Presbyters, governing the Churches by their common Counsels; knowing that they were left in this Office, and directed how to perform it by the Apostles themselves; affecting to have Disciples called by their own Name; and we may make themselves Judges whether they would voluntarily and professedly have met together, with a Design of remedying their own Vanity: Whether they would have done this by divesting themselves of the Exercise of Powers to which they had been called by the Apostles themselves or their Disciples: Nay, whether, if they had been outvoted in this Matter, they would have silently yielded, without so much as alledging for themselves the just Plea they would have had against such an Alteration, or making the least Opposition upon this Account. Add to this the Improbability that the succeeding Presbyters should agree to remedy an Evil which was in the Apostles Days: And this by a Method which (according to this Hypothesis) the Apostles refused to prescribe for this End; and by Alteration of that particular Method which they left, no Doubt, as the best and properest they could think of for the remedying this Evil, as well as others, which they knew to be in the Church. This would have been directly to have opposed their own Wisdom and Prudence to that of the Apostles themselves (which I cannot believe concerning them) and must have furnished all their Contemporaries with an unanswerable Argument against their Proceedings. And now, to recapitulate what hath been said under this Head: That the Successors of the Apostles and the Christian People should, so soon, designedly, universally, and without any Reluctance, depart from what they knew to be an apostolick Institution, is extremely strange; that they should do this in a

O 2

very

very considerable Instance; that they should do this in order to remedy an Evil which the Apostles knew to be in their own Days, and thought not proper to remedy in this Method; that the Presbyters, by doing this, should voluntarily and universally agree to restrain themselves from the Exercise of that Power and Authority, to which the Apostles themselves declare them to be called and ordained: These are Suppositions still stranger. But that this great Alteration should be contrived and effected, and universally submitted to, by the very Persons, whose Designs and Humours, and vain Affections, it was ordained to remedy and put a Stop to, is the strangest and most unaccountable Thing imaginable. And, yet, all these Suppositions must be admitted to be true and certain, if the Opinion, I am now considering, be admitted. But these Opinions are absurd and impossible. Therefore so is the Opinion founded upon them. Thus far the learned Bishop: And here I should have left our Author, as thinking these Arguments of the Bishop's to be unanswerable; as every other Person, I imagine, will also be of my Mind, who can peruse them carefully, with a Mind free from any former Biass. But I would not let go my Pen without endeavouring to satisfy every unprejudiced Person, that we have good Grounds for believing that our Succession to the Ministry from the Apostles is unbroken. But Mr. How says he will require "the most plain, positive, irrefragable Evidence, that it has been actually preserved intire to our present Bishops." Now he that demands more Evidence of a Fact than the Nature of the Thing will allow, does not deserve an Answer: For if no-body was ever to act upon any other Ground or Foundation than what was plain, positive, and indisputable; most of us must

must be content to lie still, and set about nothing. But I hope to lay before the Reader such Evidence, in Proof of what is here advanced, as will satisfy any unprejudiced Person that we have good and reasonable Grounds to go upon, when we assert that our Ministry derive their Authority, through an uninterrupted Succession, from the Apostles : And that, of Consequence, we are lawfully called to it. But in the first Place let us see what the aforementioned Bishop says : “ ‘ Sup-  
 “ posing, says he, we cannot have an exact Ac-  
 “ count of the first Settlement of particular Churches ; of their Founders, and of the Line of  
 “ Bishops succeeding in them ; this will no more  
 “ prove that there were no Bishops in them, than  
 “ the Disputes and Differences about the Succession, and Years of reigning of the Kings of any  
 “ Country, will prove that there were no Kings  
 “ in those Countries. Nay, this will no more  
 “ prove that there were no Bishops in those Churches, than that there were no Presbyters in  
 “ them : For, if this Argument prove any Thing,  
 “ it will prove too much, viz. that no Churches  
 “ of Christians were settled any where : It being  
 “ certainly as conclusive to say Historians are obscure and uncertain in their Accounts of the  
 “ Travels of the Apostles, and the Settlement of  
 “ particular Churches ; therefore there were no  
 “ Churches settled by them at all ; as it is to say  
 “ they are very uncertain in their Accounts of the  
 “ Succession of Bishops in particular Churches ;  
 “ therefore there were none.” But what Argument can this be when it is very certain, from the most ancient Writers, that there were Churches planted by the Apostles ; and Bishops settled in those Churches. And the Appeal of ancient Writers (in their Disputes with heretical Persons) to the Doctrine of the Bishops whom they affirmed



to have succeeded one another from the Apostles ; and this not contradicted by their very Adversaries ; but, as far as appears, acknowledged by all in those Days when the Falshood of it might easily have been detected ; this Appeal, I say, proves that in those early Days it was known and believed, without Opposition or Contradiction, that there was such a Succession of Bishops up to the Apostles. And this is a very great Argument for Episcopacy, though later Writers have not been able to furnish out complete Catalogues of Bishops. And so when Clemens Alexandrinus tells us that St. John went about Asia “<sup>ε</sup> in some Places constituting Bishops, in others forming whole Churches (i. e. ordaining several Bodies of Priests and Deacons with each a Bishop at their Head over his particular District) and, in other Places, putting such Persons into the Ministry as were intimated to him by the Holy Ghost.” We are not to conclude, because this early Writer does not tell us the Names of these Bishops, nor the Names of their Successors, that the Chain has been broken, and Persons have been suffered to intrude themselves into the Ministry without being lawfully called thereunto : No. We have been in actual Possession of this great Truth ever since the Apostles Times, without Contradiction ; so that all Presumption lies on our Side. And (which I would beg of the Reader to take particular Notice of) as the Case is so, and all Presumption is in Favour of us, the Onus Probandi, or Proof, lies on the other Side. The Adversary must prove that the Line has been actually broken, or else, from what has been said, we will presume that the Line has not been broken : And let Mr. How shew that if he can. But to come nearer Home.

<sup>ε</sup> Οπου μὲν ἐπισκοποὺς καταστήσων, οπου δὲ ὅλας ἐκκλησίας ἀρμόσων, οπου δὲ κληρὸν εἶναι γέ τινα κληρῶσιν ὑπὸ τοῦ πνεύματος σημαινόμενον, Clem. Alex V. 2. P. 959.

Home. It has been urged that we, in England, derive our Succession from Austin the Monk<sup>a</sup>, as ordained by Pope Gregory I. Upon this we have<sup>1</sup> a deal of Declamation about the Popes and Antipopes, and the like. But the Truth is, that Austin was not ordained by Pope Gregory, but by<sup>k</sup> Etherius Bishop of Arles in France, to whom Pope Gregory sent him for that Purpose; so that we take our Succession, not from Pope Gregory, but the Bishop of Arles<sup>l</sup>. Austin consecrated his next Successor Laurentius, and those who were his Successors, Mellitus Bishop of London, and Justus Bishop of Rochester, who consecrated Paulinus, the Converter of King Edwin and his Northumbrians; and so the English Bishops consecrated one another to the Time of the Reformation; as the Bishops, in all other Parts of the Catholick Church, consecrated one another to fill up the vacant Sees<sup>m</sup>. St. Patrick, before he went to preach to the Scots in Ireland, was ordained Bishop in France; and then went to Pope Celestine to be furnished with all Necessaries for the Voyage. It should seem by this, that the Popes did not usually apply themselves much to the Matter of Ordination in those Days. But, from hence it appears that the Popes, about whom Mr. How makes so much ado, had no Hand in delivering down to us the Succession of our Ministry. And that the Succession of our Ministry, and our Conversion, as far as the Popes had any Concern in it, was before the Church of Rome was, in any great Degree, corrupted. But yet, at that Time, as well as afterwards, they were extremely careful to prevent any one's taking upon himself the ministerial Office, without being canonically ordained<sup>n</sup>: For they would not allow of the British Bishops, as not being canonically ordained,

O 4

but

<sup>a</sup> Animad. P. 80. <sup>1</sup> Episc. P. 176. <sup>k</sup> Hicks's Controv. Lett. to a Lady, P. 207. Inett. Orig. Ang. P. 230, 231. <sup>l</sup> Hicks ubi supra. <sup>m</sup> Lloyd of the Gov. of the ancient Brit. Chur. P. 90. <sup>n</sup> Lloyd ubi supra, Cap. 6. passim.

but not because they were ordained by Presbyters, as some have dreamt; for indeed, if they had been so, they would have been uncanonical beyond Example: But it was because they were ordained but by one Bishop, contrary to the fourth Canon of the Council of Nice, which requires three Bishops, at least, to be present at the Consecration of another. And therefore, as the Popes grew more and more powerful, so the Clergy here grew more and more careful of being canonically ordained: And this made <sup>a</sup> Wilfrid, elected to the Archbishoprick of York about the latter End of the seventh Century, desire Leave to go into France for his Ordination, viz. that he might come to the episcopal Degree without the Offence of any Catholick Man; as most of the British Bishops received their Consecration from one single Bishop only. So that the very Corruptions of the Church of Rome tended to encrease their Watchfulness that no Person should be admitted into the ministerial Office, but by lawful Succession; for otherwise their Power would suffer Diminution, which they would not easily admit of. <sup>b</sup> And, in the Ancient British Church, there was a Bishop always residing, even in their Monasteries. As Columba had in his Monastery in the Island of Hy, called afterwards Iona. And why, says <sup>c</sup> Bishop Lloyd, could not the Abbot live there without a Bishop? Sure it was to do something which, without the Help of a Bishop, he could not do himself, either singly, or in Conjunction with the rest of his Clergy. And what could that be but Ordination? Now all this shews plainly how careful the ancient British Church, as well as that of Rome, ever was to preserve a lawful Succession of Bishops. And to what Purpose was that Care, but because they imagined that no Church could

<sup>a</sup> Lloyd on the British Churches, P. 128.  
&c.    <sup>c</sup> Ib. P. 102.

<sup>b</sup> Ib. P. 98,



could be provided with Clergy, if there was not a Bishop to be had that was lawfully invested with the Power of Ordination. If we consider all this; and that there never was an Instance to be found in the whole Christian World, ancient or modern, either in Churches which held or did not hold Communion with the Church of Rome, before the Reformation, of any Person whatever who executed any ministerial Office without having been lawfully ordained thereto; I would ask, Whether the Clergy of the Church of England have not all the Certainty in the World, which the Nature of the Thing can be supposed to admit of, to conclude that they are lawfully ordained to their Office by a Bishop who derives his Power, through an uninterrupted Succession, from the Apostles themselves? And I flatter myself that every unprejudiced Person will answer in the Affirmative. And here I shall take my Leave of Mr. How, and address myself to our dissenting Brethren, amongst whom the Prejudice against our most excellent Church of England, I flatter myself, is daily decreasing. And what confirms me the more in my Sentiment is that his Lordship, the present Lord Bishop of Norwich, ordained, as I am informed, not long ago, in the Chapel Royal at St. James's, two dissenting Teachers, Men seemingly advanced in Years, in Order to go as Missionaries to the Indians. I pray God bless their Endeavours. For I am satisfied that the Hopes of Gain cannot be any Motive to them to go so many hundred Miles over Sea and Land to preach the Gospel amongst barbarous Nations. And it is certain that, where the People have been perverted to the Romish Persuasion, they will be more easily recoverable from their Idolatry upon the Principles of the Church of England, wherein these were regularly ordained, than upon any other, whereby they would be put  
to

to their Shifts to satisfy a sensible Papist by what Authority they do those Things? and who gave them that Authority? For how should they preach except they be sent? And by whom should they be sent but by those who were duly invested with Power to send them? To these Questions the Clergy of our Church will always be able to return a satisfactory Answer. Especially as we have still in Being, by the Divine Favour and Providence, a 'Catalogue of all the Bishops of England and Wales, from the very first Foundation of their several Sees down to the Restoration; wherein, although there be not the Names of every one of the British and Saxon Bishops before the Conquest, yet there are so many Names preserved of those who were Bishops of the several Sees, as leaves no Room to doubt of the Preservation of a lawful Succession in those Sees; or to imagine that any Clergy were ever allowed there who had not Episcopal Ordination. But, as to these two Missionaries just mentioned, I would to God that all our dissenting Brethren were inclined to follow that Part at least of their pious Example, by returning into the Bosom of their national Church: For, if I should say, that I think they run no Hazard of their eternal Salvation, in thus keeping up a Schism, and fomenting Divisions, I should belie my own Conscience, and talk contrary to the Sense of the sacred Writers themselves, and the universal Opinion of the whole Christian Church from their Days down to the Reformation. It is therefore impossible for me to say otherwise, than that I imagine they are safer, whilst in Communion with their national Church, than they can possibly be out of it. And I pray God to touch their Hearts, that they may return to that Church, which, for near two hundred Years, hath been pure in her Faith and Worship;

<sup>a</sup> See Ch. Hist of Britain, Pages 386—421, 4to, 1675.

Worship; Apostolical in her Polity and Succession; happy in a lawful Ministry; devout in her Liturgy; intelligible in her Worship by her most illiterate Children; sound in her Catechism, Homilies, and Articles: Right and indeficient in her Ordinal; canonical in her Hours of Prayer; judicious and prudent in her Canons and Constitutions; primitive in her annual Feasts and Fasts: And, in a Word, built in every Part upon the Foundation of the Apostles and Prophets; Jesus Christ himself being the chief Corner-stone.

THE CRITICAL REVIEWERS have somewhere justly observed that Mr. Forster, in his Tract upon the Subject of these Papers, has not given us any Account of the Time when the Word *Επισκοπος* was used for a Bishop. Now I apprehend it scarce possible to assign the exact Time, when the Word had this Signification first affixed to it: But we may come within a few Years of it: For, that it was not in Use when Clemens Romanus wrote his Epistle, appears from his styling Bishops \* *ἡγου-  
μενοι* and † *προηγούμενοι*. But, in the Epistles of Ignatius, *Επισκοπος* is constantly put for a Bishop, in the Sense we use it at this Day. It should seem therefore that the Signification of the Word *Επισκοπος* was confined to the Order of Bishops, some Time between the Writing the Epistle of Clemens Romanus and those of Ignatius; and probably not long after the Death of St. John: Such being the Modesty of those primitive Bishops, that they declined taking upon themselves the high Title of Apostles, out of Respect to those inspired Preachers who received their Commission from Jesus Christ himself. But it is Matter of not a little Wonder to me, that any Body should esteem the present Subject, as of no Consequence at all to the reformed Churches:

\* Clem. Epist. I. Pag. 8. Ed. Russ.

† Ib. Pag. 94.



Churches: Because, in the Light it appears to me, whoever is a real Friend to the Protestant Religion (at the Head of which stands the truly Protestant, and soundest Part of the Catholick, Church, the Church of England) such a Man, I say, must be glad to see a Point established, which must effectually destroy the universal Supremacy of the Bishops of Rome. For, if it be true that the Apostles, wherever they went, did establish Churches, and set Bishops over them, without any the least Concurrence of the Bishop of Rome; nay, even before the Christian Religion was so much as known at Rome: And if their Successors, from that Time to this, have all along governed, each his own Church, by Virtue of no other Authority than what he had, either mediately or immediately, from the Apostle who first founded it; and that without the least Regard; but rather, sometimes, in direct Opposition, to the Bishop of Rome and his Pretensions, <sup>b</sup> as appears from St. Cyprian's Disputes with Pope Stephen; then it is impossible the Bishop of Rome should have any Authority over those Churches. <sup>c</sup> And of this the Pope, who lived at the Time of the Council of Trent, was so well apprised, that he sent Laynez the Jesuit to that Council on Purpose to set aside the intended Scheme of the French and Spanish Bishops of having the Episcopal Order and Authority declared therein to be of divine Right. And, the more easily to effect this, Father Paul tells us, that the Council allowed this Jesuit one whole Day to himself; because such a Declaration must have totally overthrown the Court of Rome, and the Pope's exorbitant Power. This will shew the Reader, that Popery and Prelacy by divine Right are two Things as incompatible with one another, as

<sup>b</sup> See Cyp. Epist. 72. 74. 75. Ed. Ox.  
 Coun. of Trent, Book 7, passim.

<sup>c</sup> See Paul's

as Light and Darkness : And I hope that what I have here said may, in some Sort, be a Means of ridding the World of those Prejudices which have taken such deep Root in the Minds of some People, and made them so averse to the Constitution of our Church ; for these Prejudices arise from the Notion that, if we allow the Episcopal Order to be of divine Right, that Opinion will lead us directly to Popery ; whereas the real Truth is, that it leads us directly from Popery : Inasmuch as, wherever that prevails, the absolute Destruction of the Pope's Supremacy must unavoidably follow. Upon this Account, the present Controversy does not appear to me to be of so trifling a Nature as some may imagine. But, however that be, if these Papers should prove the Means of reconciling even but one of our dissenting Brethren to his Mother Church ; or of preserving even but one Member of our most excellent Church steady in her Communion ; I shall not repent me of my Labour. I have endeavoured to be as clear, and easy to be understood, as I can. And that is all I desire : For, as to Witticisms and Smartness upon so sacred a Subject, my Readers will find none of that here. I leave them to Mr. How ; but withall must tell him that, if he does not produce something else besides Smartness, I shall not think it worth my While to take any further Notice of him.

*F I N I S.*